

# The Rambler,

A CATHOLIC JOURNAL AND REVIEW.

---

VOL. VIII.

NOVEMBER 1851.

PART XLVII.

---

## THE OLD PRIEST'S PARLOUR.

SCENE:— *A large old-fashioned room; the walls lined with bookshelves and pictures; the chairs and tables piled with pamphlets, papers, and books; on the mantelshelf a collection of relics from the Roman Catacombs, with a small delicately-carved ivory Crucifix in the middle; the windows half filled with fragmentary patches of old painted glass; at one of the tables, with a vacant space of a few inches cleared before him, the Rev. AUSTIN LYLE, sitting in a vast arm-chair, with a black velvet cap on his head, and slowly smoking a long German pipe. At another table, his friend Mr. EDWARD YORK, turning over the leaves of an immensely thick Blue-book, with marks of great interest and of respect for its contents.*

*After several minutes spent in alternate vigorous puffings of smoke and muttered ejaculations—such as Hm! Eight hundred and ninety-seven pages! The devil knows what he's about!—together with various subdued contortions of countenance, expressive of contempt and irritation, the old Priest relapses into a more placid state, and smokes for some time in silence. At length he speaks:*

LYLE. And so, my dear Edward, you actually believe in vertebrated animals!

YORK. Sir?

LYLE. You believe in vertebrated animals, don't you?

YORK (*with an expression of the blankest amazement*). What do you mean, Father Lyle?

LYLE. You think it desirable that your housemaid should know that kangaroos belong to the family of *Macropodidæ*; that your cook should rejoice in the conviction that apes are comprehended in the genus *Pithecus*, a branch of quadrumanous mammals, having teeth like men and women, and

possessing neither tails nor pouches. As for your occasional charwoman and your laundress, they may be content with the information that bears are a family of *Plantigrades*, and constitute a natural group of mammiferous quadrupeds, with six incisor teeth and two canines in each jaw, with twelve molars in the upper and fourteen in the lower jaw; that they are also pentadactyle, or five-toed, and that they have short tails.

YORK. Surely, sir, you are joking.

LYLE. Not a bit of it, my dear fellow. I am only answering a small portion of one of the questions to be answered by the teachers of our embryo cooks and washerwomen, which you yourself read to me out of that big book with unfeigned admiration.

YORK. I always thought you were an advocate of popular Catholic education.

LYLE. So I am, and with all my heart, I assure you. And if I were not so before, it is high time to begin now, with such a production as those "Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education" before my eyes. Why here, saving some twenty or thirty pages from the Catholic Inspector, here are 897 pages of close print devoted to shew with what a gigantic organisation the enemies of the Church of God are bringing up the children of Great Britain in the belief of every species of religious and historical falsehood. An advocate, indeed, my dear Edward; I am a hundred times more than an advocate. I tremble and shudder when I see what a machinery the enemy of our souls has here at his command; and with proportionate longings I burn to see his machinations encountered by a thoroughly Catholic system of education flourishing in every town and village in the land. But if you think to fight the devil by teaching poor boys and girls to what class of animals kangaroos belong, or by stuffing them with the jargon of science or word-knowledge of any kind, then—mark what I say—you are throwing away the most glorious opportunity given to the Church in England for many a long day, and you are adopting one of the most pernicious delusions of an age of shallowness and conceit.

YORK. But, Father Lyle, would you not teach all young persons something of the beauties of physical and natural science?

LYLE. By all means I would, *if I could*. But I cannot, and you cannot, and nobody can, in the space of time allotted to instruction in the case of the poor, and during the years of mere boyhood. This cramming with natural history, and mechanics, and astronomy, and geography, and I know not what else, is no real instruction at all. It is a mere cultivation of



the memory, a stuffing the brain with hard words and sentences which convey to the learner no positive, distinct, living acquaintance with *things*. The young mind has no natural interest in the facts of science; you have nothing to go upon in its experience and its feelings; you can only teach it words, words, words, which serve the purpose of enabling the child to pass an examination, and are then forgotten for ever, tending only to foster the natural conceit of those who think they know a little of every thing.

YORK. But surely these studies serve the purpose of strengthening the memory, and so far are useful.

LYLE. There would be something in what you say, but for one or two considerations. The memory may be equally cultivated by other studies, which are of real importance in after life, which convey ideas of things at the same time that they strengthen the memory, and which, further, bring into play various faculties left utterly barren in the process of communicating this wretched smattering of the phraseology of science. Oh, the cant, the impudence, the incredible silliness of these upholders of *useful* knowledge! *Useful*, quotha! Bah! useless, if you like, and utterly to be reprobated and cast out by every man of sound sense and earnest religion and benevolence.

YORK. Yet what will our Catholic labouring men and women do in the next generation, if they are found deficient in the knowledge which the Protestant schools are so universally conferring on their poor?

LYLE. Don't distress yourself, my dear fellow. The next generation of housemaids, and ploughmen, and greengrocers, will know no more about kangaroos, and isothermal lines, and the progress of the English language before the time of Chaucer, than Jack Smith the potboy, that I now see crossing the road and whistling one of those everlasting nigger melodies. This system of cramming the memory will produce only a race of ignorant prigs, with miserable powers of reasoning; a vulgar, snobbish taste; and a conviction that they know better than Almighty God Himself what is good for their souls and bodies. I ask you yourself, as a rational being, this question: you and I, and all the rest of what are called the educated classes, have been crammed at *our* schools and colleges with these odds and ends of science, and history, and geography, for the last two generations. There's not a young ladies' or young gentlemen's academy—(oh, what an odious word!)—where they don't learn longitudes and latitudes by the hour, together with scraps of all the sciences, and the elements of two or three languages into the bargain. Now, I say, go into any drawing-

room where you please,—say in London, from Belgravia to Hackney,—place a pair of globes in the middle of the room, and ask the well-dressed ladies and gentlemen around you to solve half-a-dozen of the “problems” which were dinned into their ears, twenty, ten, five, or two years ago, at school or college. You know what would be the ridiculous result as well as I do. Their whole actual scientific knowledge turns out to be precisely *nil*. They have gained no living ideas, no acquaintance with things; and the labour they went through led to nothing whatsoever, except the payment of the quarterly bills by their amiable and deluded parents.

The fact is, that children, like their elders, must have their minds occupied on *realities*, and not on mere senseless words and meaningless diagrams. See what painful work it is to a child to learn his letters and spelling, because the knowledge he is acquiring is to him a mere familiarity with uninteresting marks and sounds. When he begins to read, the case alters; his mind converses with things of whose nature and existence he is practically conversant, and he likes reading as much as he hated spelling. So it is in learning the first elements of any language. To most children it is an odious task; and utterly useless, unless it leads to a study of books in that language, or to its use in conversation. Now these fragments of scientific knowledge never do lead to any thing better in the case of the enormous majority of men and women. It is absolutely impossible that any real acquaintance with physical science can be attained before the age of fourteen or fifteen, which is the very *utmost* age to which the average education of most persons can be continued.

The thing is manifest even from that big book itself. Just find out those special reports on training-schools that you were shewing me, and see by the inspector's own confessions where success is best attained in teaching the young. And remember that if a branch of study is impracticable in a training-school, how much more it is so in an ordinary school. Now, then, for Mr. Moseley and Mr. Cook. Here we have Mr. Moseley at full length, pages 60 and 61, Appendix A, shewing the degrees of proficiency attained by the scholars at seven training-schools for boys of the Established Church.

You see he divides the pupils, when examined, into six classes: excellent, good, fair, moderate, imperfect, and failures. Now mark the result. In the subjects of “Industrial Mechanics,” “Popular Astronomy and Physical Science,” and the “Higher Mathematics,” the total failures *far* preponderate; while in the “Greek,” and “Latin,” and “Modern Languages,” the absolute failure is complete.



YORK. Stop, stop, Father Lyle; I have you here. Look at the class of "Excellent." There are few enough, indeed, pronounced excellent, or even good, by the inspector; but in what subjects is the greatest success, such as it is, I pray you? Why in "Geometry" and "Algebra." Aha! what say you to that?

LYLE. Precisely what I said before, that children make the best progress where their minds are conversant with subjects which to them are realities. The subjects of algebra and geometry *are* realities to a child, as much as to a grown-up person. They have nothing whatever to do with experience; they are abstractions, and as accessible to a boy's intellect as to a man's. Observe, too, that in them the memory is comparatively little tasked. Algebra and geometry are chiefly processes of reasoning, and based on a few simple ideas which a child masters with the utmost ease. I have always myself held that there are few things so easy to teach to boys and girls as algebra.

YORK. But I have heard you say also, that you would teach all our poor children Latin; and yet here it is set down as a dead failure, like "Modern Languages."

LYLE. Undoubtedly I would teach it; and why? Because to the Catholic child Latin becomes instantly a language of realities. But don't let us get on too fast. Here is Mr. Cook's report on five Church-of-England training-schools for girls: let us see what the "females," as Mr. Cook calls them, make of natural science and other subjects of study. In two of these schools "Natural History" is taught, and in both of them it is put down as a total failure. In one of them "Modern Languages" are taught, the "failures" being *ninety-one* per cent; while in two of the schools, under the head of "Biographical Memoirs," the "failures" are *ninety-two* per cent. In the other subjects, the girls succeed least in spelling and writing, while there are scarcely any "failures" at all in "Domestic Economy" and "Industrial Skill." In "Vocal Music" too the success is respectable. So much for the comparative interest of kangaroos and cookery in the minds of young girls.

But now for the Latin. With the Protestant children it is a dead failure, because they never come to *use* the little knowledge they acquire. With us the case would be entirely the reverse. The grammatical elements taught in the school would be instantly converted into realities in the offices of the Church. In the Mass, and at Benediction, Vespers, and such like, the child would find an immediate practical application for its acquirements, which would stimulate it to fresh diligence, and at the same time immeasurably increase its interest



in such offices as Vespers and Compline, which unless they are *bonâ fide* congregational, are no services at all. For hearing Mass devoutly, no doubt a knowledge of Latin is not in the least degree *necessary*; still it is undeniably an advantage, as will be admitted by every person who is even a tolerable Latin scholar. But in Vespers, and other offices not sacramental, some little degree of acquaintance with the grammatical structure of Latin is essential to a participation in the service. Thus the teaching of Latin in all our schools would not merely be facilitated by our habitual *use* of the language in devotion, but a great spiritual advantage would be conferred on our congregations.

YORK. Well certainly, Father Lyle, you *do* go lengths when you take up a notion. Why the eyes of many of our priests and nuns, and our fathers and mothers, would open into perfect circles, and their ears would shoot off from their heads, at the bare notion of teaching Latin to young ladies, much less to the ragged girls in our towns and villages.

LYLE. Well, my dear Edward, what of that?

YORK. Only conceive going into one's kitchen, and hearing a dispute between one's cook and housemaid as to the conjugation of a Latin verb; or an acquaintance with *hic, hæc, hoc* being enumerated in the merits of a groom.

LYLE. Don't be a goose, my dear fellow. Tell me this: if you went into a church and heard a whole congregation singing Vespers with good voices, correct pronunciation, and an evident comprehension of what they were saying, should you be gratified, or should you be disgusted?

YORK. Gratified, of course; who would not be?

LYLE. Then why on earth, if such a result could be easily brought about, should we hesitate to take the proper means for its accomplishment, through fear of the solemn frowns or ignorant sarcasms of some lazy father and venerable grandmother, who declare that it was not so in their young days? The question is this: is the knowledge of Latin *useful* knowledge to a poor Catholic; and if it *is* useful, is it of a nature to be acquired in boyhood and girlhood? Who that knows anything of the matter can say "No" to either of these queries? Here are you, and I know not how many other educational fanatics besides, worrying a miserable girl's brains with dry, barren, uninteresting facts about the latitude of some town in China, or the productions of some group of islands in the Pacific Ocean, or the number of toes and teeth and the digestive organs of some incomprehensible bird or beast,—all of which facts slip out of the memory during the first week after the child leaves school; and yet you look as if I had proposed

to turn all your children into opera-dancers when I say, teach the boys and girls Latin.

I should like to have a little talk with the mistresses of our poor-schools, and with the good ladies who have the educating of the girls of our middle and upper classes, and get them to give me a detailed account of all the knowledge they teach the young damsels under their care. Take my word for it, you would see that (in all innocence and good will) they drill the unlucky pupils into the temporary recollection of a whole host of facts in geography, history, arithmetic, and natural science—not to mention that crowning absurdity, “the use of the globes”—of which not one-half can by the utmost stretch of language be called either useful or interesting, and which will not exercise the slightest shadow of an influence on the well-being of their grown-up life. No, Edward, if you want *useful* knowledge, initiate the girls as well as the boys into the mysteries of Latin nouns and verbs as soon as they are nine or ten years old, and don't be afraid that your cook will burn your mutton-chops because she knows that *dixit Dominus* means the Lord said.

YORK. Well, but, sir, with so many subjects of study before us, how shall we decide what to teach children and what not to teach them? Don't you think it necessary for us Catholics not to be behind the age, in order to prevent Protestants from continuing to reproach us with being lovers of ignorance and darkness? Don't you think we should follow the age when it does not inculcate any thing positively contrary to faith or morals?

LYLE. Follow the devil, my dear sir! Why should I make a fool of myself because the age is an age of folly? I say if you follow the age, you are following the devil, who is leading an age of conceited shallow-pates to their own national, social, and domestic destruction. Follow faith and common sense as your guides, and they will tell you what to teach boys and girls, as well as a good many things besides. Faith and common sense say, when you can't keep boys and girls at school after the age of thirteen or fourteen, don't waste a single hour in cramming them with a mere knowledge of facts, which will neither add to their piety, or their intelligence, or their happiness, or their qualifications for fulfilling the secular duties of after-life. Don't teach them any thing that will be certain to be forgotten, and thus practically useless, unless the mere process of the acquisition of such knowledge contributes to strengthen and improve the intelligence and general character. Surely there is *some* end to be attained by popular education, there is some definite actual advantage supposed to be aimed at; or else the whole thing is humbug altogether.



Following faith, then, and common sense, I should say, *at all costs* give children an ample instruction in the doctrines and duties of religion, and in such collateral knowledge as will tend to confirm their faith and make them more intelligent Catholics and more useful in their generation. In my judgment, distinct religious instruction (in various branches) ought to form a larger portion of the material of a child's school-teaching than it does in any place that I know of; and this both as a spiritual advantage and as an intellectual training. Remember that no subjects of study more thoroughly drill and cultivate the mere intellect than the study of Catholic doctrines, of the history of the Church, of her rites and ceremonies, of the elementary laws of morality, and other such branches of religious knowledge.

A thorough religious education, then, being thus secured, the next thing, and the only remaining thing, is to prepare the young mind for its coming life in its secular aspects. And I say that common sense tells us that it is worse than preposterous to employ the few short years of boyhood in *any thing* that does not directly tend thus to prepare the youthful mind. Starting, then, with this principle, I see three separate secular objects to be aimed at in the education of a child: first, the communication of such positive knowledge as can be actually employed in the fulfilment of the duties of his calling; secondly, the general cultivation of the faculties of reasoning, taste, imagination, memory, and so forth; and lastly, the furnishing him with sources of innocent amusement and recreation.

And if you ask me on *what* subjects I would accordingly instruct the young, that, I say, will to a certain extent depend on circumstances; but I can easily give you a general notion of what I would do. Of course reading and writing come first, as being practically useful in after-life, and as the means for all other acquirements. Next, just so much arithmetic as will be actually made use of in the details of business and keeping of private or domestic accounts, and no more. The study of the higher branches of mere arithmetic is a profitless waste of time, and calls none of the higher faculties of the mind into play.

YORK. Excuse my interrupting you, but where would you stop in teaching arithmetic?

LYLE. Just where the *use* of arithmetic stops with nine hundred and ninety-nine men and women out of a thousand; with the majority, of course, it stops much before. In shop-keeping, and most of the higher kinds of commerce, all ordinary calculations are made by what is called "practice," and accounts are kept by "book-keeping." Not one person



in a thousand is ever called on to extract a square-root or cube-root, except for his pleasure. Stop, then, at "practice," and teach what you can of "book-keeping." The "rule of three," as it is called, and the use of "fractions" and "decimals," are infinitely better taught as a branch of algebra than as mere rules of arithmetic. In algebra they are understood and remembered. You will find that a child who has been driven to despair by the mysteries of arithmetical "fractions" and "rule of three," masters their whole theory and practice in a few days as a branch of algebra.

As to your algebraic and geometrical studies, let them be carried as far as you please. After the elements, there is not much to be learnt which will be practically useful in life; but then the study of mathematics is unrivalled for the strengthening of the reasoning faculty, while the study of arithmetic is all but powerless as an intellectual discipline.

History, properly so called, ought to be banished from schools for *children*, that is, from all our poor-schools. It is perfectly hopeless to attempt to create a genuine interest in what we understand by "history" in the mind of a mere boy or girl. *Stories* from history, if you like, they will understand and appreciate; but as for that chronological, broad, and complicated view of *events* which constitutes history, it is beyond their powers alike of comprehension and of memory. By all means, then, teach them stories from history, in any shape you please; but banish your historical summaries, your catalogues, and your elaborate chronologies, in company with your kangaroos and planetary orbits.

These stories themselves, too, should be all, more or less, in connexion with the history of the Christian Church, beyond all compare the most interesting and the most important of all histories. Remember that to a child religion is a reality, while politics, economics, manners and customs, and all the rest of the materials for secular history, are just so many incomprehensible words. Group, then, a sufficiency of stories from English and other secular history around your pictures from the records of the Bible and of the Christian Church, and you will have conferred on the young mind the very utmost amount of real historical knowledge of things which it can possibly receive before the age of fourteen, fifteen, or sixteen.

As to the communication of knowledge to be employed in the endless special varieties of social life, that is a more difficult matter; but still something may be done. Girls, of course, ought to learn needlework *thoroughly*; country boys should learn as much as can be managed of kitchen-gardening and other country pursuits; girls should be taught domestic

economy, including simple cookery and attendance on the sick; while boys in towns might be instructed in the first elements of such trades and handicrafts as could be put in practice in a large school.

English grammar, of course, ought to be taught in its elements, provided the memory is not overloaded with minute rules; and composition, by which I mean the *writing* of good, grammatical, simple English, be made a first point. In geography, again, I would teach nothing but what can be thoroughly understood, and waste no time on barren and uninteresting facts. To these subjects add music and drawing.

YORK. Drawing, Father Lyle! Well, what with Latin and drawing, you will astonish our old Conservatives.

LYLE. Very likely; but what then? Again I repeat, what says common sense on the subject? Is education meant to prepare the young for after life, or is it not? And if it is so meant, surely the furnishing the poor with sources of innocent amusement ought to be one of its *most* important aims. Don't open your eyes so wide, my dear fellow; but ask yourself what you have to say against this position, which I am prepared to maintain, paradoxical as it seems to this miserable careworn generation, that next to good religious instruction, the greatest blessing you could confer on the English and Irish poor would be a knowledge of, and taste for, harmless amusements. What on earth is the object of education, except to make people good and *happy*? What is the use of any instruction which tends to neither of these ends? I do maintain that the great curse of the British poor is their want of cheerful pleasures. Oh, how I abominate the cant of your comfortable gentlemen and ladies, with resources of every kind at hand to refresh them when they are wearied with the cares and duties of life, and who yet can coolly exact from myriads of their fellow-creatures an abstinence from amusement, which they themselves could not endure for a single day! Let the scientific knowledge-givers of the time say what they will, I repeat that if you could teach our enormous population to amuse themselves without sin, you would have bestowed on them a greater blessing than if you made them all Newtons or Herschels in profound acquirements. Don't tell me about *useful* knowledge; what's the use of any thing that doesn't make a man better or happier? Of course any information which *really* enables a man better to do his duty to his family and fellow-creatures, is to be reckoned as making him *better*; hence a good deal of purely secular instruction is both desirable and necessary. But it is a fatal error to suppose that mere knowledge or intellectual ability, as such, is



necessarily a blessing at all. Get rid of fashionable prejudices, and ask yourself whether you would rather be a happy ignoramus or a miserable scholar? Answer me as you may, I know what *common sense* would reply. And therefore, as I see that a capacity for harmless enjoyments is *not* possessed by our poorer classes, and that it is of first-rate importance for their spiritual welfare that they *should* possess such a capacity, therefore I say, the teaching of amusements ought to be a prominent feature in every good poor-school.

At present the mass of our population are brutish, bearish, clownish, and capable of little else but sensual enjoyments. Puritanism and drunkenness share their hearts between them, and do the devil's work with fearful effect. Strike at the evil, then, in its root. Teach the poor little things any amusement that you can, which will cost them little or nothing, and at once make them more civilised beings and better Christians.

I don't mean to say that drawing should be taught to *all* children indiscriminately, for many have no natural gift that way; but you must try it with all, or you cannot tell who are capable and who are not. And rest assured, that to those who *have* the slightest natural talent for drawing, a more delightful and more economical source of pleasure cannot be found.

As to singing, I fear our Catholic schools are still behind the Protestants in their cultivation of it. Absurdly enough, indeed; for considering what an important place is held by music in our religious services, the neglect of music by Catholics is doubly culpable.

YORK. But would you teach all children to sing by *note*, Father Lyle?

LYLE. Unquestionably; partly because they will never sing *well* until they sing by note, and partly because the study of the notes, and so forth, is every whit as good an exercise of the memory, the attention, and the discriminating faculty, as any other subject that you teach to children. We Catholics have an immense advantage over Protestants in our constant use of music in our public functions. Our children would feel an interest in their musical studies, if judiciously directed, far beyond what is possible to Protestant children. And after all, there's nothing like music for giving life and cheerfulness to a school. The boys and girls must be worn out indeed who don't shew signs of vivacity and good humour when the well-known signal is given, and the sounds, so inspiring to the souls of old and young, strike again upon the ear.



In music, however, as in all things else, beware of priggishness and Puritanism. Don't pester the little musicians with solemn sentimentalities, or disquisitions in natural history done into rhyme. Give them good music, good sense, and good fun. Ah, my good Edward, you may shake your rational head as you list; it does *my* ears good to hear a ringing shout of laughter—(at proper seasons, mind)—from a roomful of dingy-looking little vagabonds, grinning from their rags, and enjoying a lively, laughing song, as much as *you*, my dear fellow, and your companions, love a good song from Lablache, or a merry glee over a drawing-room pianoforte. I'm very glad to see a book of songs fit for use in schools\* published at last, which recognises *fun* as a legitimate element in school-singing. It is really delightful to see the dear old favourites of one's own childhood coming out at last in print, with a Catholic priest's name on the title-page, and in company with a whole host of tunes and verses, every one of them not only thoroughly unexceptionable, but actually *good*. If Mr. Formby's book does not find its way widely into our Catholic schools, I shall think they don't deserve to have any person take further pains to provide them with what they cry out for.

YORK. Well, really, Father Lyle, I *do* think you would hardly keep proper order in a school where such excessively *jolly* songs as some that Mr. Formby has introduced into his book were taught the children. Only conceive a schoolmaster or mistress instructing the young warblers in such songs as "What shall we have for dinner, Mrs. Bond?" or leading off a chorus, fortissimo, "A-hunting we will go!" Don't you think all this is rather silly?

LYLE. Pray, my dear sir, do you ever read *Punch*, or make jokes, or laugh at them? Do you consider it derogatory to the dignity of human nature, in the person of Edward York, Esq., aged thirty years, to go to a concert and hear John Parry sing his delicious nonsense? And if you can split your sides at "Wanted a Governess," and yet half an hour afterwards turn to your most serious duties with a refreshed spirit, why should not these little urchins go back to the toils of compound multiplication and the pains of penmanship with renewed vigour after a musical entertainment equally delectable in their young eyes? I must say, I think Mr. Formby has shewn as good sense in the *nonsense* he has put into his book as in its more solid or serious portions, including his own verses, which I think by no means the worst part of the publication.

\* "The Young Singer's Book of Songs, selected and adapted to popular Melodies," by the Rev. H. Formby. Longmans, and Burns and Lambert.

However, there goes ten o'clock, so we'll say farewell; and mind, the next heap of popular delusions you get hold of, bring them here, and we'll have a gossip over them. What a pity it is you don't smoke!

---

## STATE ENCROACHMENTS ON THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

[Concluded from p. 285.]

WE proceed to notice another episode of the reign of Henry VI., which we may call that of Chichley and Beaufort; and which will, as strikingly as others we have alluded to, illustrate that spirit of worldliness, the existence of which among the upper orders of the clergy was the pretext with the laity for aggressions upon the Church, and also united both clergy and laity in opposition to the Holy See. Chichley was Archbishop of Canterbury; and his character is sufficiently and significantly indicated by that fatal symptom of worldliness, his having held secular office, and also his having been one of the main movers of the unjustifiable war with France, which produced such disastrous results to both countries, and which (as the previous similar wars of the Edwards had done), by dissipating the treasure of the Crown, tempted it to attack the possessions of the Church. Beaufort was Bishop of Winchester, and also held secular office. He was all along (true to the spirit of the Church in this respect at least) the advocate of peace, as the Primate was of war. In the last reign the Pope had nominated Beaufort, who was undoubtedly an able man, for the dignity of Cardinal. This (says Lingard) alarmed the jealousy of the Archbishop: as the other legates had been foreigners, whose stay was too short to create any permanent prejudice to the rights of the metropolitans; but Beaufort would fix his residence in England, and by his superior authority for years suspend or restrain that of the Archbishops. The Primate persuaded the King to forbid the Bishop to accept the dignity; and in these feelings of jealousy and envy originated those arguments against the allowing of a *legate* to reside in this country, which recently have been ignorantly misconstrued as being directed against the residence of a *Cardinal* in this country, which, on the contrary, was always regarded as an honour; insomuch that (as already alluded to) in the preceding reigns statutes (even against provisors) had em-



bodied *exceptions in favour of Cardinals*; and the statute of provisors alleges it as a grievance, that the Pope gave benefices or bishoprics to aliens and to *Cardinals*, who (*being* aliens) *did not live here*; which some clever people have of late been so stupid as to interpret into a complaint *against* the residence of Cardinals in this country: so intense is the blindness and ignorance of bigotry! The Primate represented that "there never was a legate *a latere* sent into any land, and specially into the nation of England, without great and notable cause," (of which cause he forgot that the Pope was sole judge); "and they when they came, abided but a little while, as *the need required*:" as if in some periods, especially a reign so disturbed as that of Henry VI., the need might not require a longer residence of a legate, who was also an *English bishop*. And indeed the facts shew that in this instance the "need" did "require;" for the influence of the legate was of great effect in promoting peace abroad and preserving peace at home, and not until after his death did those disastrous contests commence which plunged England in civil war and all its horrors for some generations. The Primate also urged that the legate was "always treated with ere he came to land, when he should have exercise of his power, *and how much should be put into execution*." Strange doctrine this for a Catholic Archbishop!—that the exercise of the Papal power was conditional upon the consent, and liable to be restrained by an earthly sovereign! How utterly it is subversive of the Papal supremacy, no Catholic needs to be shewn; how utterly inconsistent it is with history and law, we hope our readers will, even from these articles, have been sufficiently satisfied; seeing that from the first foundation of the Catholic Church in this country, legates came and went, as Papal bulls were sent and received, at the sole pleasure of the Sovereign Pontiff: although it is possible that the occasional interference of a legate with temporal affairs (as in the reign of John) might have furnished plausible pretences for setting up some such custom as that of ascertaining, when a legate arrived, that he did not purpose any interposition in state affairs. Such attempts, however, were so rare, and so easily prevented, that they served only as a *pretext* for an opposition, as in this instance, inspired by selfish and sordid motives. The King, or rather his council, influenced by these representations, forbad Beaufort to assume the dignity offered; a prohibition directed (it is clear) exclusively against the office of permanent *legate*. Afterwards, however, he obtained the royal license to accept the preferments to which he had been nominated, and he was created Cardinal. When he arrived, the Primate and the lay lords prompted the



king's attorney-general to represent to the Council that it was the right of the Crown, founded on special *privilege* and *prescription*, (!) with the *knowledge* and *tolerance* of the Pontiffs (our readers will remark the logical and legal absurdities and incongruities of this argument, alleging *prescription* against the Pope, which never was against a *temporal* sovereign; and then incidentally disclosing the real weakness of the claim by the words "knowledge and *tolerance* of the Pontiffs")—"that *no legate should come to England unless at the petition of the king!*"

This, it will be observed, is quite different from the representation of the primate some short time before, which says nothing of this extraordinary claim, but would have certainly done so had it existed. The attorney-general out-herods the Archbishop. It is almost amusing to see the audacity with which these assumptions are trumped up against the Holy See to serve the purpose of the moment. And before the Council we also find it contended,—inconsistently enough with what had been before urged,—that Beaufort should have given up his bishopric when appointed Cardinal: so impudent and inconsistent are the assertions and assumptions to which a spirit of resistance to the Holy See from selfish motives is sure to impel men. The Cardinal retained his diocese of course. Some time after, when the Cardinal was in France with his sovereign, whom he accompanied at the earnest instance of the Council—a convincing proof that they appreciated his wisdom and sagacity,—the attorney-general was incited by the Cardinal's great antagonist, Gloucester, to impeach him before the House of Lords, on the ground that, by obtaining a bull of exemption from his diocese from the jurisdiction of Canterbury, he had incurred the penalties of the statutes of *præmunire*, especially that of Richard II., as to procuring bulls "touching the king, his crown and regalty." How absurd the accusation was, must be self-evident to our readers, and is shewn strongly by the striking fact, that when the Cardinal came home soon after, and defied his enemies in the House of Lords to come forward with any accusation against him, *no one durst do so*; but, on the contrary, all confessed him to have been a loyal and faithful subject of the Crown: a declaration which, at his demand, was entered on the rolls of Parliament. Afterwards that powerful prince, Gloucester, again assailed the Cardinal with a long and laboured impeachment, chiefly grounded on alleged contempts of the prerogatives and breaches of the statutes of *præmunire*; but neither Parliament nor the King attached any importance to it, and all fell to the ground. Surely nothing can more conclusively shew the idle

and futile character of such and all similar charges. And as it is the fashion to talk a great deal of nonsense about the worldliness and pride of Roman prelates, and the incompatibility of the duties of legates or cardinals with those of loyalty, let us close this interesting episode of Cardinal Beaufort with this simple statement, that the king himself, the best judge, from long experience, of his character and conduct as compared with the Cardinal's great rival and antagonist, the duke, declared at his death (which, despite Shakspeare's infamous and libellous picture of it, was pious and exemplary) that the Cardinal had ever been a good and kind uncle to him; while it is well known that of the duke the king at least entertained a firm conviction, confirmed by the opinion of most historians, that he was, what he often laboured to prove the prelate, an ambitious and designing man, and ultimately a traitor. Such is the episode of Cardinal Beaufort, most amply illustrating the effect of the evil spirit of worldliness in inducing the Bishops themselves to set a bad example of disobedience to the Holy See.

From the age of Beaufort we now pass to that of Wolsey, from the reign of the sixth Henry to that of the eighth. All that is necessary to notice in the reign of Henry VII. is that which will be soon seen to have had a most important bearing on the eventful reign of his successor: that the king had preyed upon his subjects, weakened by the wars of the Roses, with relentless rapacity; reviving dormant claims of the Crown—exactng payment of arrears—putting in execution all statutes, however obsolete, which created offences punishable by fine or forfeiture; and, in short, by every species of exaction and extortion impoverishing the people, now deprived of the protection of the peerage or of the Church—the latter weakened by the encroachments connived at or prompted by the former, and the peerage, as already alluded to, nearly destroyed by the bloody civil war which had succeeded the age of the “statutes of *præmunire* and provisors.” His successor, Henry VIII., spent the treasure thus accumulated far faster than his father had acquired it. And then he *wanted more*; and the problem was, *where to find it*. The laity, already awfully impoverished, did just what the Commons had done in the reign of Henry IV.; they sought to shift the burden from themselves by imposing it on the Church. And the king readily resorted to the scheme of confiscation which the selfishness of the Commons (*i. e.* the higher and wealthier orders of the laity) suggested, and which Henry IV., usurper as he was, had rejected with scorn. The course of events in this reign towards their final and fatal consummation was but a continuation, however, in



point of principle, of that pursued in previous reigns, and for some time precisely accorded with the precedents they supplied. Just as the Edwards and Henries of the last two centuries had impoverished their treasuries by foolish wars with France, and then sought to replenish them chiefly (with the concurrence of the laity) from the pockets of the clergy, just so it was with Henry VIII. Exactly as Edward I. had done, he demanded of the clergy half their annual income; whereas only five per cent was obtained from the laity. The Convocation resisted for months; but the efforts of Cardinal Wolsey at last succeeded in wringing from them the enormous contribution. Such was the worldly Cardinal's first concession to the Crown. Wolsey—the Beaufort of this reign—was certainly the most magnificent specimen of the class of churchmen to whom it is the purport of these papers to trace the fall of the Church in this country, and his was a character it is impossible to contemplate without a melancholy kind of admiration; while at the same time, in comparing, or rather contrasting such men with such as St. Anselm and St. Thomas, it is as impossible not to perceive the *littleness* of the worldly-minded, courtier-like prelate, who prefers principle to expediency.

There were at the close of the reign of Henry VII., among the Anglican prelates, Fisher and Fox; there was Wareham for a primate, and Wolsey was soon to be legate. All except Fisher (the future martyr to the papal supremacy) held secular offices; and amidst this atmosphere of worldliness Gardiner and Cranmer were imbibing ideas which led both to acknowledge the royal supremacy, therefore to add heresy to schism. Fox and Wareham were, as Wolsey was soon to be, prelates of that *secular* class we have often had occasion to characterise. Fox was privy-seal; Wareham combined the incongruous offices of Archbishop and Chancellor (which St. Thomas would *not* combine); Wolsey was a *royal chaplain*. Fisher was truly a *bishop*; and though revered by the late king as a counsellor, held no secular office. When the present and proximate heads of the English Church were men such as Wareham and Wolsey, the “end could not be far distant.” Wolsey soon relieved Wareham of the chancellorship, and at the early part of the reign of Henry was Archbishop of York, legate, cardinal, chancellor; “farmed” the revenues of Hereford and Worcester; held *in commendam* the abbey of St. Albans and the bishopric of Bath; and afterwards exchanged Bath for Durham, Durham for Winchester. That, in the language of Lingard, if he grasped at wealth, it was not to hoard it but to spend it, is of course matter of small moment

for our purpose, which is to see the effect of all this sort of system on the Church. So far as the country was concerned, at least its present and immediate advantage, we are prepared to say in passing, that the rule of magnificent churchmen, like Beaufort and Wolsey, was far more beneficial to the nation than that of secular persons of the same age; and that as we have seen in the reign of Henry VI., so long as Cardinal Beaufort lived, the country was preserved from the calamities which quickly followed his death, so in the reign of Henry VIII. the death of Wolsey appeared to let in upon the state and the Church a fearful flood of evil. But though his ability had postponed its flow, his example had prepared the way for it—the fatal example of *expediency*. He it was who, to provide for some of his collegiate establishments, *first procured the dissolution of religious houses*; he it was who, as we have just seen, countenanced the unjustifiable imposition on the clergy. How his royal pupil “bettered the example,” all our readers know, and (perhaps happily for him) the Cardinal lived not to see. There is no saying how far his courtly compliance might have carried him; and certainly all his antecedents indicate that he would have afforded a contrast, and not a comparison, to the lofty integrity of Pole. There were in Henry’s reign two English cardinals, Wolsey and Pole; the first would, there is every reason to fear, have *formally* (as he almost did *virtually*) admit the royal supremacy; the other was an illustrious confessor, one might almost say, in the person of his venerable mother, a martyr against it. Well, the first, we have seen, was a pluralist and holder of secular office; the other was a simple *prelate*; never would accept of secular office, and could scarcely ever be induced to sit at the council to give advice to the Crown, so great was his dislike to any concern in temporal matters.

Wolsey died, however, some years before the fatal measure of the royal supremacy; in one sense the inception, in another the consummation of the fearful scheme of the Reformation; its inception in point of actual execution; its consummation in the enunciation of its principle. Let us describe the state of the Church during the interval, in the words of the venerable Fisher, who was destined to protest by martyrdom against the measure. In a synod summoned by the Cardinal, the venerable prelate thus spoke:\* “May it not displease your eminence, and the rest of these grave and reverend fathers of the Church, that I say I had thought that when so many learned men had been drawn into this body, that some good matters

\* “The Life and Death of the most renowned John Fisher, some time Bishop of Rochester.”



would have been propounded for the benefit of the Church; that the *scandals* which lie so heavy upon her men, and the *disease which takes hold on them*, might have been removed and remedied. But who hath made any proposition against the ambition of those men, whose pride is so offensive, while their profession is humility? How are the goods of the Church wasted! the lands, the tithes, and other oblations of the devout ancestors of the people, spend in superfluous riotous expenses! *How can we expect our flocks to fly the pomps and vanities of this wicked world, when we that are bishops set our minds on nothing more than that which we forbid?* and the people perceive in the same men that preach this doctrine pride and haughtiness of mind, excess in apparel, and a devotion to all worldly pomps and vanities?" "Sundry times when I have settled myself in the care of my flock, to visit my diocese, to govern my church, suddenly there hath come a message to me from the court that I must attend such a triumph, to receive such an ambassador. *What have we to do with princes' courts?* Truly I know not what this *vanity in temporal things* may work in others, but sure I am that in myself it is a great impediment to devotion; and it is high time that we who are the heads should begin to give example to the inferior clergy in these particulars; *for in this course neither can there be likelihood of perpetuity in the same state and condition in which we stand, or safety to the Church.*" No more impressive summary of or commentary on the whole history we have narrated could have been presented than in these remarkable words, which, uttered many years before the commencement of the movement of the Reformation, were also as striking a prophecy as to the future as they were a truthful commentary upon the past.

The quaint old (anonymous) author from whom we have just quoted adds expressively, that "the prelates all seemed by their silence astonished, and the *cardinal's state to become him not so well.*"

If contemporaries, including one so illustrious as the emperor himself, can be credited, it was the worldly-minded ambition of Wolsey, which, by inciting him first to aspire by intrigues with Charles V. and Francis to attain to the Papacy, and then, in order to be revenged on the emperor for his imagined insincerity in the matter, to contrive the ill-starred marriage with Anne Boleyn, and the consequent divorce of Henry from the emperor's aunt, Queen Catherine, laid the foundation or supplied the first temptation to the Reformation. At the outset of the unfortunate affair, however, the Cardinal—again we say happily for himself—was disgraced and

died; affording in his memorable and melancholy exclamation, "Had I served my God as faithfully as I have served my prince, He would not have forsaken me!" a touching epitaph for his tomb, and emphatically characterising the spirit of the system the history of which we are narrating.

The Cardinal had been arraigned on the statute of *præmunire* (of Richard II.) for holding a legatine court; for which he had the express license of the Crown, and against which there was not a pretence for alleging illegality, for reasons we have already alluded to: however, as we have also already intimated, in those days the courts of law construed statutes to mean exactly what the Crown chose; and the words in this particular act, "touching the king, his crown and regalty," were made to admit of any interpretation adapted to the case. The Cardinal, for this reason, had the good sense not to provoke royal anger by a useless struggle, and pleaded guilty, though his death soon after prevented his reaping the result of his prudence. The useful precedent of his prosecution was soon followed with far greater consequences and far deeper designs.

Years before—so did "coming events cast their shadows before"—the Bishop of Paris, a shrewd observer, had predicted that whenever the Cardinal of York should fall into disgrace, the Church of England would suffer spoliation. This prophecy was as remarkable, and even more explicit, and as strikingly verified, as that of the Bishop of Rochester. The very next Parliament, in the very same year of the Cardinal's death, passed the first acts against the See of Rome; in themselves insignificant, except in point of *principle*, and on *that* view ominous precursors of those which were to follow. One of the acts imposed penalties on clergymen who should hold benefices, in violation of a statute against pluralities, under a Papal dispensation or license. That is to say, the statute practically denied that the Pope, as sovereign patron and supreme pastor, had power in any case—whatever might be the reasons in his judgment sufficient—to authorise an arrangement of a purely pastoral character at all at variance with an act of parliament. The pretence of pluralities was plausible; (it was but a *pretence*, for the Papal Constitutions made ample provision against improper pluralities and non-residence:) but the *principle involved* was neither more nor less than this, that the Pope was not supreme head of the Church. It was not so intended or understood; but it serves as a straw thrown up to shew the direction of the wind.

Next year the great event occurred. To get rid of the opposition of the Pope to the divorce, and to pave the way



for the confiscation of Church property, the open assumption of spiritual supremacy had been suggested, and seized at by the king: and the means adopted for making the clergy assent to the monstrous claim were simple and sufficient, and shewed a perfect knowledge on the part of the king of their character. The statute of *præmunire* was made the medium of pecuniary pressure. An absurd "information" was filed against them on that statute, as abettors of the Cardinal in the proceedings under his legatine court. Convocation offered 100,000*l.* for a full pardon. The king declined the offer, *although much in want of money*. The reason is clear: he knew the acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy was worth far more than ten times 100,000*l.* to him; that it, in fact, put the whole Anglican Church and all her property utterly at his mercy, and cut the knot of all questions with the Holy See; and made him, in short, as absolute in Church as he already was in State. Under the weak, worldly-minded presidency of Archbishop Wareham, who had survived his supplanter Wolsey, (and survived, alas, the Church of which he had been consecrated Primate!) the royal supremacy was affirmed, with the addition of words ("so far as the law of Christ allows") which really were only a subterfuge; since, as Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, (who, except Fisher of Rochester, was the only prelate who had the courage to oppose the blasphemous proposal,) unanswerably urged, if the claim meant no more than that the king was *head in temporals*, why did he not say so? And accordingly the useless addition was soon discarded by the king, and the naked acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy extorted and *acted upon*.

*How and for what purpose* it was acted on, we are anxious should be especially observed. Throughout the remainder of the reign no other alteration was effected in the national faith. The principle had not, then, been established for *spiritual* purposes. During a whole reign this great principle lay practically *dormant* so far as the *faith* was concerned; since although Henry repeatedly used his new prerogative of spiritual supremacy, it was in protecting or enforcing, not in *changing*, the rest of the Catholic faith. More than one reason makes it important to remark this. We may observe in passing, that it totally destroys the Anglican theory (or fiction) of the Reformation, that the Anglican Church synodically, and with due, deliberate "synodical action," "reformed" the formularies of her faith, and so forth. The plain fact is, that she had—years before any change in the liturgy or formularies of faith—*given up all power over them*, and bound herself hand and foot under the iron yoke of the spiritual supremacy of the Crown; and

that this was not a voluntary and conscientious rejection of the papal supremacy, but was plainly extorted from the Church by threats of confiscation, and *against their consciences*; and that many years afterwards—by this prerogative of spiritual supremacy so conceded, *contrary to conscience*,—the *sovereign* reformed the formularies of the faith, and in reality changed the faith, by the sole power of the State. For our present purpose, however, it is more pertinent to observe, that the real reason why the king had extorted the confession of his spiritual supremacy was, that he might use it not for spiritual purposes (except for the temporary purpose of the marriage), but for *temporal*. Undoubtedly, *but* for the marriage he might not have troubled himself with the theological prerogative, but have availed himself of the plainer precedents of his predecessors, and simply seized, as Edward I. once did, the possessions of the monasteries or of the churches for his own use. This would have been, after all, only a development of the statutes of provisors; for those acts prevented the Church from *controlling her own property*; and there would be consistency, after that, in *taking it away*. To get rid of a marriage, however, it was requisite to assume the *spiritual*; while, on the other hand, the assumption was an unerring means to the other end, the confiscation of Church property. Hitherto we have seen the Crown in its pursuit of the temporal possessions of the Church indirectly; and, except for that purpose, unintentionally affecting her spiritual powers. Now we have the Crown avowedly, and more consistently, claiming that same spiritual supremacy which had long been, though not virtually, at all events impliedly, if not assumed by itself, at least limited or restrained in the Holy See. The statute of the royal supremacy confirming the decree of convocation was the consummation of this assumption, and in principle the consummation of the Reformation. It is not necessary for our present purpose to trace out the gradual development of the principle through all the multiform and fluctuating phases of error which the Reformation assumed in the course of the century in which it was carried out, or of the two centuries succeeding, in which, even up to our own time, the ultimate *results* and real character of that principle have been by degrees elucidated even to the most incredulous. This would afford ample matter for attention. But our present purpose is to shew how the unqualified assumption of the royal supremacy was the natural and logical development of the principles and premisses we have disclosed, as admitted by the Anglican Church in preceding reigns, particularly from the time of the statutes of “provisors” and *præmunire*. It will have been remarked that



the statutes of *præmunire* were the weapons made use of to coerce the clergy into the acknowledgment of the royal supremacy. And they were themselves, we have shewn, a rapid and natural result of the statutes of provisors, and these again but the formal legislative expression of a principle long previously acted upon, that the endowment of the Church gave the Crown and laity a *right* to limit the pastoral power of her Supreme Pastor, by interposing certain "claims" of *nomination* and *presentment*, on their part, as paramount and precedent to the exercise of the power of her supreme pastorage; in short, that the temporal property was more important than the spiritual "see" or cure of souls to which it was attached, but which must be considered secondary, subordinate, and subservient. In a word, that the *temporal must be supreme over the spiritual*.

And what is this but the principle of the royal supremacy in the bud, in the germ, unperceived, unacknowledged to exist, but nevertheless *there*, in all its poisonous essence and its pernicious influence, destined in due time to develope and put forth its flowers and fatal fruit. That time had now arrived; the soil of the Church was rank, and had ripened the fruit to perfection, and the king now gathered it. If the papal supremacy might be indirectly fettered and interfered with for the sake of protecting supposed temporal rights, why not directly for the same purpose? And if the Crown or the State could so fetter and interfere with it, then must the secular power be superior to the spiritual; and if so, then the assumption of the royal supremacy was natural, logical, and consistent, nay *necessary*. This will be made more plain by an example or two, illustrative of the way in which the principle was now put into practice for temporal purposes.

All along we have shewn that the assertion and admission of this principle in its first germ alike arose from *sordid* motives; the mere *love of money*, which has ever been the "root of all evil." That this motive equally incited the Crown to seek to encroach on the temporal rights of the Church, and with that view to encroach on the papal supremacy; and also incited the higher orders of the clergy, more or less, to support the Crown for the sake of preserving or procuring ecclesiastical preferment; and lastly, induced the laity to side with the Crown equally against the Holy See and against the clergy, to cast on the Church as much as possible of the burdens of the state, and so protect their own pockets. And this "wretched interchange of wrong for wrong," this sordid *reaction* of selfish motives, will be clearly seen in the catastrophe of the religious houses, that first fruit of the royal supremacy,

that first stage in Church spoliation; which also will amply illustrate, by comparison with the transactions of previous reigns, the close connexion between the present and the past, and the identity of the principles involved.

It will be remembered that in noticing the reigns of the Edwards and Henries, we have remarked that with respect to Church property, the acts passed in those reigns might have supplied Henry VIII. with some useful precedents. We deferred a full explanation of our meaning, which is, that the *principles* asserted or implied in those statutes really involved a right of the Crown to do all that Henry now did. An act of Edward I. recites (in language similar to that of the statute of provisors as to benefices and bishoprics) that monasteries, priories, and other religious houses, were founded (*i. e.* endowed) by the king's progenitors, and the ancestors of the nobles of his realm, and lands and tenements given to them, to the intent that clerks and laymen might be admitted to them, and sick and feeble men maintained, and almsgiving, and hospitality, and other charitable deeds done therein, and prayers said for the souls of the said founders: and then the statute enacts that the religious houses should not send any money out of the country at the order of their superiors abroad, with a proviso that "it is not the meaning of the king to exclude the superiors from executing their office of visitation," so that they did not carry out of his kingdom any money as treasure. Now here, although the purview of the act is temporal, yet it shews an utter disregard of any indirect encroachment on the spiritual that might ensue from it. It certainly implies the very principle we pointed out as implied in the similar recital of the statute of provisors, that because the ancestors of the "king and his nobles" endowed the bishoprics and benefices and religious houses, the right of seeing to the due discharge of the duties belonging to them, and of the intentions of the founders, was in the Crown and Parliament, instead of in the Pope; a principle actually tantamount to this, that the moment endowment takes place, the royal is substituted for the papal supremacy. This consequence was doubtless not contemplated; but the principle is implied, and will be found slowly and insidiously developing itself from time to time. Thus, in the reign of Henry V. another statute passed on the subject of religious houses, reciting in very similar terms to those of the former one, "that forasmuch as many hospitals had been founded by the kings of this realm, and lords spiritual and temporal, to the honour of God and his glorious Mother, in aid and merit of the souls of the said founders, to which hospitals the said founders have given a



great part of their goods and lands; it is ordained, that as to the hospitals which are of *the patronage of the king*, the ordinaries, *by virtue of the king's commission* to them to be directed, shall *inquire of the governance and state of the said hospitals.*" Now the principle is here plainly put forth, that over all religious houses or bishoprics or benefices endowed by the Crown at any period, the Crown, and *not the Holy See*, had *supreme right of visitation!* What remained, then, for Henry VIII. but to put into practice this principle? He did so; and but for the matter of the marriage, probably would not have cared to *assume* the spiritual supremacy, however much it was *implied* in the principle thus enunciated, or in proceedings putting it in practice. And this is not the less so, notwithstanding that so little was the principle *understood* to be implied, that the predecessor of Henry V. rejected with scorn a scheme for putting it in force, which Henry VIII. eagerly resorted to.

And the scheme was suggested by the minister who had suggested the assumption of the royal supremacy, and who suggested it chiefly for the sordid purposes of plunder. Cromwell, the author of the scheme, was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and had to provide funds for his master's dissipation, and on *his* part the assumption of the supremacy was designed as a preliminary to Church spoliation; not the less necessary, in his cunning apprehension, because the principle was logically implied in acts already passed. Logical implication he knew was one thing; national apprehension another; and therefore he had the supremacy *affirmed* by convocation and Parliament to be in the Crown, and then who could exclaim against its being put in force?

It *was* so; and in the course of sacrilegious spoliation which ensued, it is wretched to remark the same sordid system of subservient *connivance* going on in the Church, of which we have all along traced the disastrous consequences, the cause and consequences of deep-seated corruption. The abbots and priors acquiesced in the spoliation of the *smaller* houses; the bishops and secular clergy in the spoliation of the larger; the laity (at least the higher classes) in the plunder of all; and all alike for the sake of conciliating the favour of the Crown, and being considered *loyal*. But let it not be overlooked, that before the English Church was spoiled, she had as a body consented to a measure of spoliation upon the Holy See; and not merely had parliament, comprising the *bishops and abbots*, abolished the papal supremacy, but passed acts depriving the Holy See of rights it had possessed from time immemorial, and as much sanctioned by law as the possession of their own

temporal endowments. The Anglican Church, then, as a body, not less than each class comprised within her, received in ensuing rapine a rich retribution. Having concurred with the Crown in a sacrilegious sacrifice of the rights of the Holy See, the Crown sacrificed them also in their turn. And when, long after, they repented, it was *too late*; the season of repentance, at least of reparation, was gone, although "they sought it carefully with tears." The nation did not unlearn the lesson they had taught so quickly as the teachers, and having once tasted the sweets of plunder, thirsted, tiger-like, for more; a thirst not satiated until slaked in the desolation of the State and the blood of their sovereign.

Let us take another example to illustrate the truth we are anxious to establish, that the Anglican Church, by conceding measures detrimental, however indirectly, to the papal supremacy, laid the foundation of the Reformation.

When Henry had obtained from convocation the acknowledgment of his spiritual supremacy, he proceeded, putting it consistently in force, to demand from them their solemn engagement never to enact any constitution without the royal authority and assent, and to submit all now in force to a commission to be chosen by the Crown. They remonstrated, but durst not resist. How should they? Why, their predecessors had conceded the principle two centuries before, when they assented to certain statutes of *præmunire*, providing that no bulls or instruments of the Pope which the Crown or the lay courts chose to consider touched the regalty of the realm,—in other words, interfered with state-craft, or court corruption, or lay patronage, or the right of presentment, or by whatever other name might be designated the sordid system of *traffic* in benefices and bishoprics,—ought not by law to be introduced into the country; that is to say, the Anglican Church had thus declared that the Crown, and not the Holy See, was the supreme judge as to what bulls should be published, or what sentences of excommunication pronounced, by the Pope. And after having assented to *this*, how idle and absurd to assume for *themselves* a greater authority than they had admitted to their head, the Vicar of Christ, the supreme Pastor of the Church! If *he* was to submit to the secular power, why should not *they*? The Anglicans of those days were really almost as inconsistent as the Anglicans of ours.

We have seen what kind of men had supported the Crown all along, and connived at its successive encroachments on the Church; to the last they were the same. From such as Folliot in the reign of Henry VI., to such as Wareham or Wolsey in the reign of Henry VIII., they were *men of the*



*world*, men fond of the world, and so moved by worldly motives of *expediency*; men who cared more to be thought *loyal* subjects of the Crown than consistent children of the Holy See; men who cared for what the Crown could give,—worldly possessions and honours, power, place, pre-eminence, and reputation. What can be wanted to prove our proposition, for which we have all along contended, that worldliness is identical with indifference; that care for the things of the world is inconsistent with care for the things of the Church; that to be subservient to the Crown where the Church is concerned, it is impossible to be faithful to the Church, and requires men to be attached to what the Crown can give. But the same conclusion is established as clearly by reversing the inquiry, and observing who were they who *resisted* these encroachments, and remained faithful to the Church and the Holy See. Only those who *cared not for the world*: seculars like the saintly Fisher (very few of them, alas!), or religious, who observed consistently the rule of poverty and the principle of detachment from the world. While the courtly bishops and abbots and priors, the lords of parliament, were easily assenting to and enacting the royal supremacy, the severe religious orders, the Carthusians and the “Observantines” (Franciscans), especially the last, were every where preaching against it; and while Feckenham, the rich Abbot of Westminster, was, as a lord of the Council, endeavouring along with Cromwell (fit companion truly for the superior of a religious house in such a work!) to seduce or intimidate More into an assent to the king’s blasphemous assumption, the monks of the Charter-House were hung for denying it, and the *entire Observantine order were expelled the country*;—a noble and memorable distinction they earned by the most uncompromising opposition to the unscrupulous monarch and his unprincipled parliament. And what was the secret? The Franciscan prior Peyto told it when, in answer to a brutal threat of Cromwell’s, he replied with a smile, “Threaten such things to rich and dainty folk, *which are clothed in purple, fare deliciously, and have their chiefest hopes in this world. We esteem them not. We are joyful that for the discharge of our duty we are driven hence.*”

And now we must close. In truth, our task is done. It was simply to trace to the doors of these rich and dainty folk, who “had their chiefest hopes in this world,” and so of course were courteous and “conciliatory” towards it, that blasphemous exaltation of the royal over the papal supremacy, which was in order of *time* the inception, in order of *principle* the *consummation* of the Reformation; and to shew that the character and conduct of those who in past ages connived at the

encroachments of that secular power, which ever thus "exalteth itself against God," exactly accord with the character and conduct of those who, in our own age, encourage the Crown to set up still more monstrous claims—(more monstrous, seeing that of old the Crown had at least the pretence of *endowments*), whose conduct has always been worldly and corrupt, and whose character was depicted, by Him who "knew what was in man," in these simple words—"they loved the praise of men, and sought honour one of another, and not the honour that cometh from God."

---

### Reviews.

#### NEWMAN'S LECTURES ON THE POSITION OF CATHOLICS IN ENGLAND.

*Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England: addressed to the Brothers of the Oratory.* By John Henry Newman, D.D., Priest of the Congregation of St. Philip Neri. Burns and Lambert.

IT is no exaggeration, but the bare truth, to assert that the sentiments entertained by Protestants towards the Catholic Church are inexplicable, except on the supposition that Catholicism is from God. It is impossible to analyse these sentiments, to trace them through their various ramifications, to witness their practical results, and to note the fact that they are totally without parallel in the views held by the numerous sects of non-Catholics towards one another, and not come to the conclusion that something more than man inspires their undying animosity against us. They would grant themselves, indeed, that this animosity is more than human in its origin, and claim for it a divine authorship. But not to put forward the impossibility of a divine authorship for a state of mind compounded of a wilful ignorance of facts, a deliberate repetition of falsehoods, and a savage hatred of millions upon millions of their fellow-creatures,—the Protestant view cannot be a divinely inspired abhorrence of error and sin, because it co-exists with the extremest laxity of judgment towards the errors and sins of all those who are not Catholics.

The anti-Catholic spirit is, in truth, as we have said, without a parallel upon earth. The abhorrence of Protestants towards Jews, Pagans, and Mahometans, is in comparison a fraternal affection; the Protestant "denominations," fiercely



as they are opposed when their peculiar interests happen to clash, are gentle in their wildest attacks on each other, in contrast with the hatred with which *at all times* they view the Catholic Church. This hatred possesses men and women of every temper and age. The mother forgets her love for her child, the father abhors his own flesh and blood, the friend turns round to slander the beloved companion of half his life, the tender heart that shrinks from crushing a worm cries out for extermination, imprisonment, and even blood. Reason with them, they call you a Jesuit; conciliate them, they throw your kindness back into your face; be patient, and you are a sneaking coward; be courageous, and you are a seditious rebel; cling to your poverty, and you are a filthy beggar; be prudent in managing your means, and you are purchasing souls; if you prove any thing, you prove too much; if you leave truth to do its own work unsupported, you have nothing to say; if you are not a fool, you are a knave; if you are not a knave, you are a fool; you *ought* to be, you *must* be, you *shall* be, every thing that is false, impure, deceitful, treacherous, and diabolical, and therefore you *are* all this.

What is it that we shew to Protestants that, if one half of what they say of us is true, the other half *must be* false; that we only ask to be heard in our defence; that we shew that Catholic kingdoms, and Catholic families, and Catholic societies, could not exist for an hour, if Catholicism were what they assert it to be? They have already determined that we are guilty; they count it a mockery and an insult to their understandings to listen to us. To extenuate Catholicism is like proving the multiplication-table false. The thing is absurd. Our proofs, our arguments, our facts, are but illustrations of our ingenuity in wickedness; our appeals to their good feelings, to their common sense, to their personal experience, are so many traps for the seducing the unwary. "I *hate* Catholicism and Catholics," cries the Protestant, "and there is an end of it."

All this, then, we say, is sufficiently intelligible on the supposition that the Catholic faith is from God, and that the natural heart of man revolts from the allegiance it owes to God, while it is incessantly worked upon and led astray by a supernatural agency which devotes all its energies to the blinding of men's eyes to the truth of God's words. Grant this, and the mysterious phenomenon is explained. The perennial frenzy of man against the Church is nothing more than the passionate resistance of the rebellious soul to the divine power, whose sway it dreads, under the secret influence of the devil himself.

And hence, further, if we ourselves would meet this opposition aright, it is of the first importance that we never for a moment forget its true nature, or essay to overcome it by weapons which are adapted for a contest with men in a rational frame of mind. If the Protestant view is, as we maintain, so senseless, so mad, so selfish, so atheistic, so utterly satanic in its origin, it is plainly a mere waste of time to adopt a line of conduct based on the supposition that it is nothing more than ignorance which arrays our foes against us; that Protestants desire to do us justice; that they can be won over by conciliation, by compromise, or by the concealment of the more obnoxious of our dogmas and practices. It is not this or that doctrine which scandalises them; it is not that they have had no opportunities of learning our true creed; it is not that they are prepared to act on the principles of plain dealing, and what they call their English love of fair play; they do not *desire* to know the truth about us; they have surrendered themselves to a bondage to their passions and to Satan; they keep their tenderness and honourableness for themselves and for the affairs of this world; for us there is neither mercy nor justice.

Of course, we do not mean that there are *no* exceptions to this rule. Yet they are few, and scattered here and there. Nor do we mean that we are to neglect any opportunity for removing prejudices and instructing the ignorant, when there is a fair chance of success. What we think is, that the best way to convince Protestants of their foolishness and errors is to force the truth upon them as it is, and to leave Almighty God to bring it home to their *consciences*. *We* cannot counteract the machinations, without which human hostility would be a trifle. *We* cannot meet Satan in the secret chambers of the soul, and oppose our reasonings to his suggestions. The grace of God alone can do this; and it is our firm conviction that the grace of God *does* this most bountifully, when we place our whole dependence upon grace for victory, and lay aside all hope of conquest from acting on the natural good sense, amiableness, and fairness of men. Surely we have all of us enough to do without going out of our way, and wasting our time in profitless controversy with persons who shew not the slightest desire to know what is true. Surely the simplest and the most accomplished Catholic alike have before them a boundless choice of good deeds to which they may betake themselves, *with a certain prospect of doing great good*, instead of throwing away their energies and their personal comfort in encounters with an enemy who cares nothing for the laws of honourable warfare, and who desires only one thing,—our utter extermination from the face of the earth.



The hopelessness of any attempt to conciliate the goodwill of Protestants (of course, as we have said, with exceptions) will be still further manifest when we examine into the actual *opinion* they entertain regarding the Catholic Church. Considering what they *think* of Catholics, we can hardly wonder at the malevolence of their temper towards us. It is nothing that their view is irrational, baseless, and even monstrous in the extreme; all this matters not, so long as they hold it. In truth, the very fact that it *is* so incredibly preposterous and silly, is a proof that it is something more than a common popular error. The belief in so palpable a series of falsehoods as those which Protestants from generation to generation believe respecting Catholics, *can* come but from one source; and coming from that source, it is clear that no mere human instrumentality can avail to dissipate it.

This opinion, then, is twofold; it is compounded of a conviction of our falsehood and a conviction of our power. Marvellous as it seems, it may be said with truth that there are few Protestants to be found who do not, more or less, share in the idea that the whole Catholic priesthood are leagued together, as conscious deceivers, for the purpose of enslaving the bodies and souls of mankind. The Catholic laity are supposed to be, for the most part, their deluded instruments or their secret foes. But whether the laity share in the organisation or not, the Protestant mind is unceasingly haunted by the belief that deception is the very soul of Catholicism. Here may be an honest priest; there may be a zealous, upright, and educated layman; *this* act may be undeniably straightforward; *that* prayer may be uttered from an unfeigned heart;—all these, thinks Protestantism, are but the exceptions; there must be deceit *somewhere*; and that deceit is the whole secret of the existence of Popery. You may not be able to trace it out in this or that individual case; you may be balked when you would lay your finger on this or that detected lie; this is but the result of the superhuman *craft* of Popery; it is its masterpiece, that it *cannot* be proved wrong. If the laity are honest, then the priests are the tricksters; if the parish priests are honest, then it is the bishops who are working the jugglery; if the bishops are blameless, it is the monks who are the accomplished adepts; if the monks, again, are deceived and not deceivers, then it *must* be the Pope; and if the Pope, poor man, is, after all, more sinned against than sinning, why there are the Jesuits at the bottom of it all.

We are confident that we are not exaggerating the fact when we say that, more or less, with some few exceptions, this notion of the existence of some mysterious instrument of de-

ception in the Catholic Church has possession of English Protestants of every rank, save perhaps the poorest. The most enlightened, the most candid, the most charitable, the most Catholic in feeling, come under its portentous sway. We appeal to those who, having been educated as Protestants, have submitted in after life to the Church, for confirmation of the truth of what we say. Admitting great differences of degree, undoubtedly, they will bear their testimony to the almost universal existence of this suspicion of our good faith. They once shared it themselves; it required not merely a resolute effort, and an opening of the eyes to facts, but long-continued familiarity with Catholicism in order to shake it off. Whence it came, they could not tell; on what ground it rested, they could not point out; even when they had learnt to perceive its absurdity, and strove to cast it from them, still it clung to them, and haunted them, and whispered "Beware!" until at length, by the grace of God, and the knowledge of facts, and the intimate perception of the reality of Catholic uprightness and simplicity, they became so habituated to the truth, as to think an imputation of deception to the Catholic system about as rational an idea, as the belief that the six-and-twenty "bishops" of the Establishment are leagued together for the promotion of one and the same theological creed.

Combined with this amazing infatuation, there exists in the Protestant mind an indescribable dread of the power of the Church. *Why* their boasted age of reason should have any thing to fear from any thing so irrational as Popery, they fail to state; *why* some hundreds of millions of human beings should voluntarily surrender themselves as slaves to a few thousand priests, a few hundred Jesuits, or a single Pope, they forget to reflect; *how* it is that Irish kitchen-maids are to bring mischief into British households; *who* it is that is to light the Smithfield fires, burn the Protestant Bibles, control the administration of justice, bribe the members of parliament, take a seat at the cabinet councils of the Queen, alter the Protestant succession, or cause the Majesty of England herself some morning to awake and find herself a Papist; by whom, or how, these miracles are to be accomplished, shuddering Protestantism disdains to inquire. Unreflecting, uninquiring, it knows only how to tremble. As the fowls of the air droop their wings and flee to their coverts before the coming tempest, long before the senses of men can detect its approach, so the flocks of Protestantism snuff the gale with angry aspect, the moment the very sound of Popery is borne upon the breeze.

Yes; and indeed with reason! There *is* a secret which



is the life of the Church ; there *is* a power that she wields, which, when it is put forth, can sweep away the myriads of her enemies, as the thunder-blast strews the hills and valleys with the prostrate birds of the air. That secret is the possession of the word of God ; that power is his omnipotent grace ! Let them fear, then, and be afraid, and feel their blood run cold, when even a whisper from the Vatican disturbs the repose of their island sky. There is One upon the earth whom they know not ; One who made the heavens, and who can unmake the handiwork of Luther and Elizabeth ; and before whose breath, when it shall please Him to send it forth upon them, they, and their laws, and their tyranny, and their hatred, shall flee, and be seen no more !

Meanwhile, *our* path is clear. What avails it to reason with men who are incapable of reasoning rightly ? What can disturb the complacency of men who reject all proof, on the ground that the cogency of our arguments is only a proof of our preternatural skill in deception ? Why waste our breath on men who are convinced that the worse *is* the better reason when Popery is concerned ? Let us hope nothing from Protestant candour, but every thing from the almighty power of God, blessing the instrument which He has appointed, viz. the simple, bold, persevering setting forth of unadulterated Catholic truth before the eyes of all men.

We cannot too strongly express our conviction that a recognition of this great truth is of primary importance in our intercourse with the Protestant world. Apologies, framed on a kind of supposition that Protestantism is a tribunal before which Catholicism is summoned to exculpate itself from grievous charges ; controversies, in which Catholic doctrines are proved (?) on Protestant grounds ; appeals to English justice, to the natural kind feelings of the heart, to men's love of truth ; all these, and such as these, we regard as worse than useless ; *of course, with exceptions*. There is but one safe, wise, and successful mode of carrying on the warfare ; and that is, to remember that it *is* a warfare ; that we are the soldiers of Almighty God ; that we are bound to be assailants, and not mere defenders ; and that we must fight with the weapons which our Captain has placed in our hands. There is but one alternative before us—disgraceful defeat, *or* victory.

Such, then, being, as we conceive, the true statement of the case between Catholics and Protestants, our first work will be, as Father Newman happily expresses it, to *reconnoitre* the enemy's camp, and ascertain his mode of fighting. And this Father Newman has himself done for us, in his lectures recently delivered at Birmingham, with a precision, a clearness

and width of view, and a felicity of statement, unrivalled by any other writer on the tactics of Protestantism. The work, viewed with reference to the author's object, is as completely successful, and as thoroughly practical, as any which has yet proceeded from Father Newman's pen. That Protestants, indeed, should do it justice, cannot be expected. It is no pleasant thing, even for a generous foe, to see the incredible follies, and treacheries, and malice of his own supporters, exposed with a quiet truthfulness and penetrating force, which leaves it doubtful whether Protestantism is more wicked or more absurd. Priggish and puritanical, too, as is the English mind in general, we do not doubt that many are the phrases of grave displeasure, and preternaturally portentous the dignified frowns, with which various classes of Father Newman's readers will lament over certain portions of his lectures. That "Sunday religionism," which is the characteristic of every attempt at religiousness outside the true Church, and which renders our misbelieving countrymen unable to conceive how a man can be really serious who in religious things intermingles food for laughter with food for tears, will feel itself doubly outraged when *itself* is the object of the satirist's arrows. Far, indeed, is Father Newman from ridiculing any thing that is really an object of religious regard by the most mistaken of misbelievers. No man has ever shewn himself more tender of every thing that bears the slightest claim to respect and mercy. It is those monstrous exhibitions of perverseness, folly, and crime, *which Protestants themselves profess to condemn*, at which he strikes without sparing, and which they would be the first to denounce, were they not blinded by that spirit of infatuation which is at once the curse and the safeguard of semi-conscientious heresy.

That the lectures, nevertheless, will do great good to Protestants, we have little doubt. Some they will silence, to some they will teach caution, some they will compel to think, and many they will prepare for a reception of those divine truths which it is not the *direct* object of these lectures to establish. For once the Protestant world will be astonished to find itself treated *as manifestly in the wrong*. For once it will be made to feel that it is on the defensive; and that in the eyes of Catholics Protestantism wears the aspect of folly, as well as that of heresy. For once it will have some slight sense of that moral and intellectual humiliation, of which it would be always conscious, could it see itself as we see it.

The apparent literary merit of the several lectures naturally varies according to the subject, and different Catholic readers will appreciate them differently, according to the personal in-



terest they feel in the special subject which the lecturer may be particularly handling. The opening lecture we think the least successful of the whole, the ingenious application with which it commences being worked out at too great length, though with a charming felicity of language and illustration. The imaginary speech, at the termination of the same lecture, also strikes us as the only weak passage of any length in the volume. At the same time, the true character of the Protestant view of Catholicism is brought out with singular force and accuracy. That view is what we commonly call *conventional*. It is like the view of a landscape which a man gets by putting on a pair of blood-red spectacles. Protestants never look at us with a clear, straightforward vision. They start with an *idea* of us, with a *view*, which distorts and discolours every object, so that all seems at once monstrous and bloody. If they hear of Brahminism, or Mahometanism, or Mormonism, or mesmerism, or of Californian or Australian gold, or of the old Greeks and Romans, or of their next-door neighbours who are not Catholics, or of Methodists, or of railway speculations, or of any other conceivable object on earth, to a certain extent they fairly *look at* the subject before them; they ask for facts; they do not start by assuming that they knew all about it from their cradles. But in our case the "view" is every thing. The trees in the landscape are not green, the sky is not blue, buildings are not upright, men and beasts do not walk upon their feet; the distorting, fiery medium turns all into deformity and blood.

"The simple notion," says Father Newman, "of most people is, that Christianity was very pure in its beginning, very corrupt in the middle age, and very pure in England now, though still corrupt every where else; that in the middle age a tyrannical institution, called the Church, arose and swallowed up Christianity; and that Church is alive still, and has not yet disgorged its prey, except, as aforesaid, in our own favoured country: but in the middle age there was no Christianity any where at all, but all was dark and horrible, as bad as paganism, or rather much worse. No one knew any thing about God, or whether there was a God or no, nor about Christ nor his atonement; for the blessed Virgin, and saints, and the Pope, and images, were worshipped instead; and thus, so far from religion benefiting the generations of mankind who lived in that dreary time, it did them indefinitely more harm than good. \* \* \*

"So much for the middle ages; next I will take an instance of modern times. If there is any set of men in the whole world who are railed against as the pattern of all that is evil, it is the Jesuit body. It is vain to ask their slanderers what they know of them: did they ever see a Jesuit? can they say whether they are many or few? what do they know of their teaching? 'Oh, it is quite notorious,' they reply; 'you might as well deny the sun in heaven; it

is notorious that the Jesuits are a crafty, intriguing, unscrupulous, desperate, murderous, and exceedingly able body of men; a secret society, ever plotting against liberty, and government, and progress, and thought, and the prosperity of England. Nay, it is awful; they disguise themselves in a thousand shapes, as men of fashion, farmers, soldiers, labourers, butchers, and pedlars; they prowl about with handsome stocks, and stylish waistcoats, and gold chains about their persons, or in fustian jackets, as the case may be; and they do not hesitate to shed the blood of any one whatever, prince or peasant, who stands in their way.' "

"How, then," replies the more reasoning Protestant, "if this view is absolutely false, how comes it to exist at all? There *must* be a cause for so universal a feeling. Account for it, I say, on any other supposition than its substantial justice. We can supply a history, a rationale, of every other universal belief; do this, Catholic controversialists, in your own case, and point out how the Protestant view was born, and how it lives, on your own hypothesis that it is a false view."

To such a supposed questioner, Father Newman commences his reply in the second lecture; and here all the brightness of his powers of observation and analysis shines out. "I say," he replies (though we are not quoting his very words), "that the Protestant view is a *tradition*, of which I can point out the birth, the parentage, the motives of its authors, the means they took to propagate it, and the elements in human nature which they employed for the purpose of ensuring it a long life, and upon which it still exists and thrives."

"Englishmen," to turn to Father Newman's own expressions, "entertain their present monstrous notions of us mainly because those notions are received on information, not authenticated, but immemorial. This it is that makes them entertain those notions: they talk much of free inquiry, but towards us they do not dream of practising it; they have been taught what they hold in the nursery, in the schoolroom, in the lecture-class, from the pulpit, in the newspaper, in society. Each man teaches the other: 'How do *you* know it?' 'Because *he* told me;' 'And how does *he* know it?' 'Because *I* told *him*;' or, at very best advantage, 'We both know it because it was so said when we were young; because no one ever said the contrary; because I recollect what a noise, when I was young, the Catholic Relief Bill made; because my father and the old clergyman said so, and Lord Eldon, and George the Third; and there was Mr. Pitt obliged to give up office, and Lord George Gordon, long before that, made a riot, and the Catholic chapels were burned down all over the country.' Well, these are your grounds for knowing it; and how did those energetic Protestants whom you have mentioned know it themselves? Why, they were told by others before them, and those others by others again a great time back;



and there the telling and teaching is lost in fog: and this is mainly what has to be said for the anti-Catholic notions in question. Now this is to believe on *tradition*."

This tradition was established and nationalised by Queen Elizabeth and her supporters. Henry VIII. created it; but to his daughter and her cunning government it owes its permanence. How they did this, and how the affairs of the world fell in with their schemes, Father Newman shews in his happiest manner. The sagacious intellects who were the ruling spirits of the English Reformation, he says,

"Had to deal with a people who would be sure to revolt from the unnatural speculations of Calvin, and who would see nothing attractive in the dreamy and sensual doctrines of Luther. The emptiness of a ceremonial and the affectation of a priesthood were no bribe to its business-like habits and its love of the tangible. Definite dogma, intelligible articles, formularies which would construe, a consistent ritual, an historical ancestry, would have been thrown away on those who were not sensitive of the connexion of faith and reason. Another way was to be pursued with our countrymen to make Protestantism live; and that was, to embody it in the person of its sovereign. English Protestantism is the religion of the throne: it is represented, realised, taught, transmitted in the succession of monarchs and an hereditary aristocracy. It is a religion grafted upon loyalty; and its strength is not in argument, not in fact, not in the unanswerable controversialist, not in an apostolical succession, not in sanction of Scripture, but in a royal road to faith, in backing up a king whom men see, against a Pope they do not see. The devolution of its crown is the tradition of its creed; and to doubt its truth is to be disloyal towards its sovereign. Kings are an Englishman's saints and doctors; he likes somebody or something at which he can cry 'huzzah,' and throw up his hat. Bluff King Hal, glorious Bess, the Royal-Martyr, the Merry Monarch, the pious and immortal William, the good King George, royal personages very different from each other,—nevertheless, as being royal, none of them come amiss, but all are the objects of his devotion, and the resolution of his Christianity.

"It was plain, then, what had to be done in order to perpetuate Protestantism in a country such as this. Convoke the legislature, pass some sweeping ecclesiastical enactments, exalt the Crown above the law and the gospel, down with the cross and up with the lion and dog, toss all priests out of the country as traitors, let Protestantism be the passport to office and authority, force the king to be a Protestant, make his court Protestant, bind Houses of Parliament to be Protestant, clap a Protestant oath on judges, barristers-at-law, officers in army and navy, members of the universities, national clergy; establish this stringent tradition in every function and department of the state, surround it with the lustre of rank, wealth, station, name, and talent; and this people, so impatient of inquiry, so care-

less of abstract truth, so apathetic to historical fact, so contemptuous of foreign ideas, will *ex animo* swear to the truth of a religion which indulges their natural turn of mind, and involves no severe thought or tedious application. The sovereign is the source and the centre, as of civil, so of ecclesiastical arrangements; truth shall be synonymous with order and good government;—what can be simpler than such a teaching? Puritans may struggle against it, and temporarily prevail; sceptics may ridicule it, object, expose, and refute; readers of the Fathers may strive to soften and embellish it with the colours of antiquity; but strong in the constitution of the law, and congenial to the heart of the people, the royal tradition will be a match for all its rivals, and in the long-run will extinguish the very hope of competition.

“So counselled the Ahithophels of the day; it was devised, it was done.”

The most potent of the external causes which aided the Elizabethans, the lecturer thus describes. Its influence over educated men and women, *down to this very hour*, probably few can estimate, except those who have been for a time seduced by its fascinations.

“Protestantism became, not only the tradition of law and of good society, but the tradition of literature also. There is no English literature before the age of Elizabeth; but with the latter years of her reign begins that succession of great authors which continues to flow on down to this day. So it was that about the commencement of the sixteenth century learning revived; on the taking of Constantinople by the Turks, the men of letters of the imperial city, and, what was of more consequence, its libraries, became the property of the West. Schools were opened for the cultivation of studies and pursuits, which make Greece as renowned among the nations in the gifts of intellect, as Judea has been in the gifts of grace. The various perfections of the Greek language, the treasures of Greek thought, the genius and taste of Greek art, after the sleep of ages, burst upon the European mind. It was like the warmth, the cheerfulness, and the hues of spring succeeding to the pure and sublime, but fantastic forms of winter frost-work. The barbarism, the sternness, the untowardness of the high and noble mediæval school, eyed with astonishment, and melted beneath, the radiance of a genius unrivalled in the intellectual firmament. A world of ideas, transcendent in beauty and endless in fertility, flooded the imagination of the scholar and the poet. The fine arts underwent a classical development, and the vernacular tongues caught the refinement and the elegance of the age of Pericles and Alexander. The revival began in Catholic Italy; it advanced into Catholic France; at length it shewed itself in Protestant England. A voice came forth from the grave of the old world, as articulate and keen as that of a living teacher; and it thrilled into the heart of the people to whom it came, and it taught them to respond to it in their own tongue,—and that teaching was coincident



with the first preaching of Protestantism. It was surely a most lucky accident for the young religion, that, while the English language was coming to the birth with its special attributes of nerve, simplicity, and vigour, at its very first breathings Protestantism was at hand to form it upon its own theological *patois*, and to educate it as the mouth-piece of its tradition. So, however, it was to be; and soon,

‘As in this bad world below  
Noblest things find vilest using,’

the new religion employed the new language for its purposes in a great undertaking, the translation of its own Bible; a work which, by the purity of its diction and the strength and harmony of its style, has deservedly become the very model of good English, and the standard of the language to all future times. The same age, which saw this great literary achievement, gave birth to some of the greatest masters of thought and composition in the most various departments of authorship. Shakespeare, Spenser, Sidney, Raleigh, Bacon, and Hooker are its own; and they were, withal, more or less the panegyrists of Elizabeth and her religion, and moreover, at least the majority of them, adherents of her creed, because already clients of her throne. The Mother of the Reformation is, in the verses of Shakespeare, ‘a fair vestal throned by the west;’ in the poem of Spenser she is the Faery Queen, Gloriana, and the fair huntress Belphebe; while the militant Christian is rescued from the seductions of Popery, Duessa, by Una, the true Church, or Protestant religion. The works of these celebrated men have been but the beginning of a long series of creations of the highest order of literary merit, of which Protestantism is the intellectual basis, and Protestant institutions the informing object. What was wanting to lead the national mind a willing captive to the pretensions of Protestantism, beyond the fascination of genius so manifold and so various? What need of controversy to refute the claims of Catholicism? what need of closeness of reasoning, or research into facts, when under a queen’s smile this vast and continuous tradition had been unrolled before the eyes of men, illuminate with the most dazzling colours, and musical with the most subduing strains?”

The Protestant view, thus sustained by tradition, is destitute of every species of support from past or present facts. It rests on fable, invented, propagated, and believed by knavery, by folly, by credulity, by the shallowest ignorance. Of these fables the third lecture contains a few striking specimens, one of which refers to the building of the house for the Oratory at Birmingham. Father Newman thus exposes the marvellous violation of all common sense, and kind and gentlemanly feeling, into which Englishmen are led in their madness against the Church, and their voracity for charges against her:

“I feel ashamed, my brothers, of bringing my own matters before you, when far better persons have suffered worse imputa-

tions ; but bear with me. I, then, am the accused. A gentleman of blameless character, a county member, with whose near relatives I have been on terms of almost fraternal intimacy for a quarter of a century, who knows me by repute far more familiarly (I suppose) than any one in this room, putting aside my personal friends ; he it is who charges me, and others like me, with delighting in blood, with enjoying the shrieks and groans of agony and despair, with presiding at a banquet of dislocated limbs, quivering muscles, and wild countenances. Oh, what a world is this ! Could he look into our eyes and say it ? Would he have the heart to say it, if he recollected of whom he said it ? For who are we ? Have we lived in a corner ? Have we come to light suddenly out of the earth ? We have been nourished, for the greater part of our lives, in the bosom of the great schools and Universities of Protestant England ; we have been the foster-sons of the Edwards and Henries, the Wykehams and Wolseys, of whom Englishmen are wont to make much ; we have grown up amid hundreds of contemporaries, scattered at present all over the country, in those special ranks of society which are the very walk of a member of the legislature. Our names are better known to the educated classes of the country than those of any others who are not public men. Moreover, if there be men in the whole world who may be said to live *in publico*, it is the members of a college at one of our Universities ; living, not in private houses, not in families, but in one or two apartments which are open to all the world, at all hours, with nothing, I may say, their own ; with college servants, a common table,—nay, their chairs and their bedding, and their cups and saucers, down to their coal-scuttle and their carpet-brooms,—a sort of common property, and the right of their neighbours. Such is that manner of life, in which nothing, I may say, can be hid ; where no trait of character or peculiarity of conduct but comes to broad day,—such is the life I myself led for above a quarter of a century, under the eyes of numbers who are familiarly known to my accusers ; such is the life which we all have led ever since we have been in Birmingham, with our house open to all comers, and ourselves accessible.”

This point is carried out further in the following lecture, in which the failure of attempts to argue down Catholicism on real facts (even when, so far, they tell against us) is contrasted with the incredible success of the most unblushing falsehoods. Thus Blanco White's book against the Church, grounded on his knowledge of certain persons in Spain, produced little or no effect, and was suffered to become permanently out of print ; while Maria Monk's melodrama of horrors, the produce of her own diseased brain, which was rejected as a malicious fable by Protestants on the spot where she professed to have witnessed the crimes she narrates, has reached a circulation of nearly a quarter of a million copies.

Meanwhile, Protestantism is its own condemnation. Hu-



man nature and common sense burst through its pretended principles, and the Protestant world daily and systematically adopts those very practices which it condemns in Catholics, and is led by its own theories into enormities far exceeding those which it imputes to the laws and principles of Catholics. Image-worship, oath-breaking, persecution, and clerical celibacy, thus furnish Father Newman with striking illustrations of the logical inconsistency of the Protestant view.

How, then, is this perennial injustice and intellectual inconsistency possible in a being constituted as man is by nature, and in a state of society like that in which we now live? The phenomena of anti-Catholicism are so preposterous as to appear incredible, unless we can give some sort of metaphysical analysis of a moral and intellectual depravation so abnormal and degrading. What is the disease which thus warps the Protestant judgment, and turns a man of sense, candour, and honour into something nearly approaching idiocy or madness, when he comes in contact with Catholicism? That disease is *prejudice*. In the mind of our adversaries judgment is already given against us. If we are brought into court to undergo the mockery of a trial, it is only that we may afford sport to our persecutors. Whatever we urge, we are misunderstood; whatever we prove, our arguments are set aside as beneath examination; the mind of our assailants is nothing less than incapable of dealing fairly with us. What prejudice is, and how it differs from a mere act of the judgment, Father Newman lays down with great felicity.

For this passage, as well as for his wittily drawn picture of the prejudiced man's mode of arguing on the Catholic religion, we fear we have no space; but the following we cannot forbear extracting:

“One word here as to this growth of Catholicism, of conversions and converts;—the Prejudiced Man has his own view of it all. First, he denies the fact that there are any conversions or converts at all. This is a bold game, and will not succeed in England, though I have been told that in Ireland it has been strenuously maintained. However, let him grant the fact that converts there are, and he has a second ground to fall back upon: the converts are weak and foolish persons—notoriously so; all their friends think so; there is not a man of any strength of character or force of intellect among them. They have either been dreaming over their folios, or have been caught with the tinsel embellishment of Popish worship. They are lack-a-daisical women, or conceited young parsons, or silly squires, or the very dregs of our large towns, who have nothing to lose, and no means of knowing one thing from another. Thirdly, in corroboration: they went over, he says, on

such exceedingly wrong motives; not any one of them, but you may trace his conversion to something distinctly wrong; it was love of notoriety, it was restlessness, it was resentment, it was lightness of mind, it was self-will. There was trickery in his mode of taking the step, or inconsiderateness towards the feelings of others. They went too soon, or they ought to have gone sooner. They ought to have told every one their doubts as soon as ever they felt them, and before they knew whether or not they should overcome them or no. If they had clerical charges in the Protestant Church, they ought to have flung them up at once, even at the risk of afterwards finding they had made a commotion for nothing. Or, on the other hand, what, forsooth, must these men do, when a doubt came on their mind, but at once abandon all their clerical duty and go home, as if it were possible any where to be absolutely certain? In short, they did not become Catholics at the right moment; so that, however numerous they may be, no weight whatever attaches to their conversion. As for him, it does not affect him at all; he means to die just where he is; indeed these conversions are a positive argument in favour of Protestantism: he thinks still worse of Popery in consequence of these men going over than he did before. His fourth remark is of this sort: they are sure to come back. He prophesies that by this time next year not one of them will be a Catholic. His fifth is as bold as the first: they *have* come back. This argument, however, of the Prejudiced Man admits at times of being shewn to advantage, should it so happen that the subjects of his remark have, for some reason or other, gone abroad, for then there is nothing to restrain his imagination. Hence, directly a new Catholic is safely lodged two or three thousand miles away, out comes the confident news that he has returned to Protestantism, when no friend has the means to refute it. When this argument fails, as fail it must by the time a letter can be answered, our Prejudiced Man falls back on his sixth commonplace, which is to the effect that the converts are very unhappy. He knows this on the first authority; he has seen letters declaring or shewing it. They are quite altered men, very much disappointed with Catholicism, restless, and desirous to come back, except from false shame. Seventhly, they are altogether deteriorated in character; they have become harsh, or overbearing, or conceited, or vulgar. They speak with extreme bitterness against Protestantism, have cast off their late friends, or seem to forget that they ever were Protestants themselves. Eighthly, they have become infidels; alas, heedless of false witness, the Prejudiced Man spreads the news about right and left in a tone of great concern and distress; he considers it very awful.

“Lastly, when every resource has failed, and, in spite of all that can be said, and surmised, and expressed, and hoped, about the persons in question, Catholics they have become and Catholics they remain, the Prejudiced Man has a last resource; he simply forgets that Protestants they ever were. They cease to have antecedents; they cease to have any character, any history to which they may



appeal. They merge in the great fog in which, to his eyes, every thing Catholic is enveloped; they are dwellers in the land of romance and fable; and if he dimly contemplates them plunging and floundering amid the gloom, it is as griffins, wiverns, salamanders, the spawn of Popery, such as are said to sport in the depths of the sea, or to range amid the central sands of Africa. He forgets he ever heard of them; he has no duties to their names; he is released from all anxiety about them; he dies to them."

"Still," we may imagine a reasoning anti-Catholic to reply—"still there must be something more to bring out, before I see the whole process of the creation and nurture of this universal Protestant rancour. Surely Protestantism, at least in the case of the more educated ranks, must have *some* intellectual basis to rest upon. It is impossible but that your opponents, so innumerable, so respectable, so much given to reasoning in general, so capable of systematising their notions on other things, should be destitute of all ground for their intense feelings against you. Why, after all you have said in disproof of Protestant calumnies, does there remain a certain mysterious aptitude for accepting every fresh accusation against Catholicism? You tell us that the devil is the cause of it all; but that is not the question. Even granting a supernatural exciting power, I want to know *how* it acts upon us. Granting that it acts by means of this 'prejudice' in many instances, it certainly does not so in all; or at least prejudice is not the only source of hostility which it arouses against you. Explain this, then, if you can."

"I admit your statement," Father Newman substantially replies. "You have an intellectual basis, on which your more rational controversialists, whether consciously or unconsciously, rest their theories; while the same basis is more or less recognised by our most fanatical enemies. You have certain *assumed principles*, from which you start, and which you receive as geometrical axioms, as necessarily true, as needing no proof, and which are in direct contradiction to certain dogmas and practices of the Catholic faith." This point forms the subject of the seventh lecture, which we regard as one of the most able and the most important of the whole series; and we especially recommend it to careful attention, as furnishing a key to the whole mystery of anti-Catholic hostility, and as shewing the special point of attack upon which our controversial energies should be ever concentrated.

We can find room, however, but for one paragraph, which furnishes an instance of the lecturer's own way of illustrating the principle which he recognises, that *in a certain sense* ridicule is the test of truth. He has been putting in a

forcible way the arrogant narrow-mindedness with which popular Protestantism decides upon Catholicism, on its own unproved principles, ignoring history, and contradicting facts; and then he proceeds:

“What is all this but the very state of mind which we ridicule, and call narrowness, in the case of those who have never travelled? We call them, and rightly, men of contracted ideas, who cannot fancy things going on differently from what they have themselves witnessed at home, and laugh at every thing because it is strange. They themselves are the pattern men; their height, their dress, their manners, their food, their language, are all founded in the nature of things; and every thing else is good or bad, just in that very degree in which it partakes of them. All men ought to get up at half-past eight, breakfast between nine and ten, read the newspapers, lunch, take a ride or drive, dine. Here is the great principle of the day—dine; no one is a man who does not dine; yes, dine, and at the right hour; and it must *be* a dinner, with a certain time after dinner, and then in due time bed. Tea and toast, port wine, roast beef, mince-pies at Christmas, lamb at Easter, goose at Michaelmas, these are their great principles. They suspect any one who does otherwise. Figs and macaroni for the day's fare, or Burgundy and grapes for breakfast!—they are aghast at the atrocity of the notion. And hence you read of some good country gentleman, who, on undertaking a Continental tour, was warned of the privations and mortifications that lay before him from the difference between foreign habits and his own, stretching his mind to a point of enlargement answerable to the occasion, and making reply, that he knew it, that he had dwelt upon the idea, that he had made up his mind to it, and thought himself prepared for any thing, provided he could but bargain for a clean tablecloth and a good rump-steak every day.”

Such is anti-Catholicism in its origin, its basis, its habits, and its principles. How, then, has it contrived to exist unchanged in an age when all thought has been revolutionised? By the most easily practised of devices. Simply by refusing to listen to the other side. With few exceptions, the Protestant world declines all intercourse with Catholics or their writings. The less they know of us, the more competent they conceive themselves to argue against us. Catholic doctrines and practices are so contemptibly silly and contrary to reason, that it is a mystery how any man of sense can accept them; and yet Catholics and Catholic books are so fascinating and plausible, that there is no safety for Protestantism, but by sending the former to Coventry, and by putting the latter on an *Index Expurgatorius*. The eighth of Father Newman's lectures thoroughly exposes this “protection of the Protestant view.”



The following extract happily illustrates and exposes the mode in which Protestants form their views of Catholicism :

“ In Tetzels famous form at the beginning of the Reformation we read as follows : ‘ shouldest thou not presently die, let this grace remain in full force, and avail thee at the point of death.’ On this Dr. Waddington, ordinarily a cautious as well as candid writer, observes : ‘ [it cannot] be disputed that it conferred an entire absolution, not only from all past, but also from all future sins. It is impossible with any shadow of *reason* to affix any other meaning to the concluding paragraph,’ which is the one I have quoted. Reason ! how can reason help you here ? could you have found out that ‘ absolution’ meant ‘ leave for communion’ by reason ? Some things are determined by reason, others by sense, and others by testimony. We go to dictionaries for information of one kind, and to gazetteers for information of another. No one discovers the price of stocks, ministerial measures, or the fashions of the year, by reason. Whatever is spontaneous, accidental, variable, self-dependent, whatever is objective, we must go out of ourselves to determine. And such, for instance, is the force of language, such the use of formulas, such the value of theological terms. You learn pure English by reading classical authors and mixing in good society. Go, then, to those with whom such terms are familiar, who are masters of the science of them, and they will read the above sentence for you, not by reason, but by the usage of the Church ; and they will read it thus : ‘ If thou diest not now, but time hence, this indulgence will then avail thee, that is, in that case in which alone an indulgence ever can avail, *i. e.* provided that thou then art in a state of grace.’ There is no prospective pardon in the words so explained ; an indulgence has nothing to do with pardon ; it is an additional remission upon and after pardon, being the remission of the arrears of suffering due from those who are already pardoned. If on receipt of this indulgence, the recipient rushed into sin, the benefit of the indulgence would simply be suspended till he repented, went to confession, and gained a new spirit. If he was found in this state of pardon and grace at the point of death, then it would avail him at the point of death. Then that pardon, which his true repentance would gain him in the Sacrament of Penance, would be crowned by the further remission of punishment through the indulgence ; not otherwise. If, however, a controversialist says that a common Catholic cannot possibly understand all this, that is a question of fact, not of reason ; it does not stand to reason that he cannot ; reason does not come in here. I do not say he *will* express himself with theological accuracy, but he knows perfectly well that an indulgence is no pardon for prospective sin, no standing pardon for a state of sin. If you think he does not, come and see. That is my key-note from first to last ; come and see, instead of remaining afar off, and judging by reason.

“ There are Protestant books explaining difficult passages of the Old Testament by means of present manners and customs among the Orientals,—a very sensible proceeding, and well deserving of

imitation by Protestants in the case before us ; let *our* obscure words and forms be interpreted by the understandings and habits of the Catholic people. On the other hand, in Dean Swift's well-known tale, you have an account of certain philosophers of Laputa who carried their head under their arm. These sagacious persons seldom made direct use of their senses, but acted by reason ; a tailor, for instance, who has to measure for a suit of clothes, I think, is described not as taking out his measures, but his instruments, quadrant, telescope, and the like. He measured a man as he would measure a mountain or a bog ; and he ascertained his build and his carriage as he might determine the right ascension of Syrius or the revolution of a comet. It was but a vulgar way to handle and turn about the living subject who was before him ; so our Laputan retreated, pulled out his theodolite instead of his slips of paper, and made an observation from a distance. It was a grand idea to make a coat by private judgment and a theodolite ; and, depend upon it, when it came home, it did not fit. Our Protestants wield the theodolite too ; they keep at a convenient distance from us, take the angles, calculate the sines and cosines, and work out an algebraic process, when common sense would bid them ask us a few questions. They observe latitude and longitude, the dip of the needle, the state of the atmosphere ; our path is an orbit, and our locus is expressed by an equation. They communicate with us by gestures, as you talk to the deaf and dumb ; and they are more proud of doing something, right or wrong, by a ceremony of this kind, than of having the learning of the Benedictines or the Bollandists, if they are to go to school for it."

After this, the lecturer draws his practical conclusion. It is briefly this : distrust all human supports, and give your whole strength and skill to the forcing upon the Protestant world a knowledge of your faith, your history, your practices, and yourselves.

"You are attacked," he says, "on many sides ; do not look about for friends on the right hand or on the left. Trust neither Assyria nor Egypt ; trust no body of men. Fall back on yourselves, and trust none but yourselves. I do not mean you must not be grateful to individuals who are generous to you, but beware of parties ; all parties are your enemies ; beware of alliances. You are your own best, and sure, and sufficient friends ; no one can really hurt you but yourselves, no one can succour you but yourselves. Be true to yourselves, and success is in your hands. Be content to have your conscience clear, and your God on your side. \* \*

"Protestantism is fierce, because it does not know you ; ignorance is its strength ; error is its life. Therefore bring yourselves before it, press yourselves upon it, force yourselves into notice against its will. Oblige men to know you ; persuade them, importune them, shame them into knowing you. Make it so clear what you are, that they cannot affect not to see you, nor refuse to justify you. Do not



even let them off with silence, but give them no escape from confessing that you are not what they have thought you were. They will look down, they will look aside, they will look in the air, they will shut their eyes, they will keep them shut. They will do all in their power not to see you; the nearer you come, will they close their eyelids all the tighter; they will be very angry and frightened, and give the alarm as if you were going to murder them. They will do any thing but look at you. They are, many of them, half conscious they have been wrong, but fear the consequences of learning it; they will think it best to let things alone, and to persist in injustice for good and all, since they are for so long a time committed to it; they will be too proud to confess themselves mistaken; they prefer a safe cruelty to an inconvenient candour. I know it is a most grave problem how to touch so intense an obstinacy, but observe if you once touch it, you have done your work. There is but one step between you and success."

And thus he addresses the Catholic laity. It is our last quotation; but of its importance we cannot speak too strongly.

" 'There is a time for silence, and a time to speak;' the time for speaking is come. What I desiderate in Catholics is, the gift of bringing out what they are, what their religion is; it is one of those 'better gifts' of which the Apostle bids you be 'zealous.' You must not hide your talent in a napkin, or your light under a bushel. I want a laity, not arrogant, not rash in speech, not disputatious, but men who know their religion, who enter into it, who know just where they stand, who know what they hold and what they do not, who know their creed so well that they can give an account of it, and who know enough of history to defend it. I want an intelligent, well-instructed laity; I am not denying you are such; but I mean to be severe, and, as some would say, exorbitant in my demands. I wish you to enlarge your knowledge, to cultivate your reason, to get an insight into the relation of truth to truth, to learn to view things as they are, to understand how faith and reason stand to each other, what are the bases and principles of Catholicism, and where lie the main inconsistencies and absurdities of the Protestant theory. I have no apprehension you will be worse Catholics for familiarity with these subjects, provided you cherish a vivid sense of God above, and that you have a soul to be judged and to be saved. In all times the laity have been the measure of Catholicism; they saved the Irish Church three centuries ago, and they betrayed it in England. Our rulers here were true, our people were cowards. You ought to be able to bring out what you feel and what you mean, as well as feel and mean it; to expose to the comprehension of others the fictions and fallacies of your opponents; and to explain the charges brought against us, to the satisfaction, not indeed of bigots, but of men of sense, of whatever cast of opinion. And one immediate effect of your being able to do all this, will be your gaining that proper confidence in self which is so necessary for you. You will

then not even have the temptation to rely on others, to court political parties or particular men; they will rather have to court you. You will no longer be dispirited or irritated (if such is at present the case) at finding difficulties in your way, in being called names, in not being believed, in being treated with injustice. You will fall back upon yourselves; you will be calm, you will be patient. Ignorance is the root of all littleness: he who can realise the laws of moral conflicts, and the incoherence of falsehood, and the issue of perplexities, and the end of all things, and the Presence of the Judge, becomes, from the very necessity of the case, philosophical, long-suffering, and magnanimous.

"Cultivation of mind, I know well, is not the same thing as religious principle, but it contributes much to remove from our path the temptation to many lesser forms of moral obliquity. Human nature, left to itself, is susceptible of innumerable feelings, more or less unbecoming, indecorous, petty, and miserable. It is, in no long time, clad and covered by a host of little vices and disgraceful infirmities,—jealousies, slynesses, cowardices, frettings, resentments, obstinacies, crookedness in viewing things, vulgar conceit, impertinence, and selfishness. Mental cultivation, though it does not of itself touch the greater wounds of human nature, does a good deal for these lesser defects. In proportion as our intellectual horizon recedes, and we mount up in the knowledge of men and things, so do we make progress in those qualities and that character of mind which we denote by the word 'gentleman;' and if this applies in its measure to the case of all men, whatever the religious principles, much more is it true of a Catholic. Your opponents, my brothers, are too often emphatically *not* gentlemen: but it will be for you, in spite of whatever provocations you may meet with, to be manly and noble in your bearing towards them; to be straightforward in your dealings with them; to shew candour, generosity, honourable feeling, good sense, and forbearance, in spite of provocation; to refrain from taking unfair or small advantages over them; to meet them half-way, if they shew relentings; not to fret at insults, to bear imputations, and to interpret the actions of all in the best sense you possibly can. It is not only more religious, not only more becoming, not only happier, to have these excellent dispositions of mind, but it is far the most likely way, in the long-run, of persuasion and success."

If, however, there are any of our Catholic readers who may be disposed to doubt the prudence of the system thus recommended, we earnestly beg their attention to the following reflections, with which we shall conclude. There are prevalent amongst us, Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, two views as to the mode in which it is most politic to present the Catholic faith to our unbelieving fellow-countrymen. We are not, of course, in the slightest degree impugning the motives of those who adopt that one of these two views which we ourselves conceive to be erroneous; we are merely stating



the fact, that while some amongst us would set the faith before the world in its open, undisguised, actually existing reality, as it is embodied in the worship, the books, the practices, and the ideas of the most thoroughly Catholic portions of the great Catholic family; others would pare down our creed to the lowest proportions which faith will tolerate, and adapt it (as they imagine) to the national peculiarities of Englishmen, and the prejudices of Protestants. What is fit for Italy and Belgium, say the disciples of the latter school, is not fit for England. Devotions, books, saints' lives, popular practices, church services and decorations, miraculous histories, and various other such matters, which are well enough in a Catholic country, ought not to be put forward before a people steeped, like the English, in the depths of heresy, unbelief, and prejudice. Do not put forth legendary tales, do not speak of miraculous relics, do not say a word about St. Januarius and the Madonna of Rimini, do not put up too many images in your churches, do not let the people decorate them with trumpery, do not say too much about the "glories of Mary" and the "power of Mary," do not make much of such devotions as the Sacred Heart of Jesus, do not let your monks go about without shoes and stockings, do not popularise your services, do not profess your loyalty to the Pope so loudly, hush up such historical facts as the existence of an Inquisition in Rome, talk a great deal about the Bible and circulate it, and say nothing of the few copies of the Scriptures which are to be found among the poor in Catholic countries; in short, make Catholicism as *respectable* and as little *supernatural* as possible, in order to commend it to the *common sense* of the more "liberal" portion of the English nation.

Can, then, this latter theory be upheld consistently with the great truth expounded and enforced in the seventh of the lectures before us? We think, ourselves, that they are utterly irreconcilable, and that the attempt to confer an apparent Protestantism on Catholicism is as philosophically erroneous as it is unwarranted by actual facts. The hostility of Protestants lies far deeper than in a local or personal distaste for certain ceremonies or devotions, or a disinclination for the miraculous and supernatural when not rigidly established by proofs. The conflict between Catholicism and Protestantism is one of *first principles*; and until those principles are brought face to face, no real progress is made towards an understanding between the parties. Contests about this or that detail in Catholic customs, this or that miraculous story, this or that misinterpretation of a Scripture text, are mere beatings about the bush. The real question between us is not even touched. Strip our re-

ligion of all its so-called extravagances, bad taste, and superstitions, and the innate hostility of our enemies remains precisely what it was at the beginning ; for this reason, that it is *not* directed against the non-essentials of Catholic opinion and practice, but against the elementary doctrines of the Catholic faith itself. Protestant hostility is, in truth, nothing more than the hostility of the natural heart of man to the revelation which Almighty God has made concerning Himself and his will. The natural mind is the enemy of God ; it rebels against his authority ; it dreads his approach ; it shrinks instinctively from any doctrine which declares his immediate presence ; it abhors any practice which forces on itself a consciousness of the damnable nature of sin, and of its own sins in particular ; in a word, it hates the Catholic faith, because that faith introduces Almighty God himself into his own world, treads under foot human pride, and claims an absolute obedience of body, soul, and spirit to the divine will. The assumed principles of Protestantism are nothing more than a set of axioms directly in contradiction with the elements of all revelation and pure morality. They are the whispers of Satan, accepted and appropriated by the human mind as its reasons for setting God at defiance. And until those principles are dethroned from their supremacy, not one single step is made towards the conversion of a soul. The disease is not touched ; it is the symptoms alone which for a brief time may be palliated.

There is scarcely a Catholic doctrine or practice which does not thus conflict with the natural godlessness and haughtiness of man. The Real Presence is painful, because man shrinks from the immediate presence of God ; confession is intolerable, because it enforces a practical self-knowledge and a recognition of the hatefulness of sin ; images and the invocation of Saints are odious, because they compel us to feel that we are living in the midst of an invisible world ; the magnificence of Catholic worship is distasteful, as conveying a reproach to those who spend their wealth on earthly gratifications ; the virtues of relics, and all miraculous events in general, are a fearful testimony to the almighty power of God, of his nearness to us, and of the littleness of human power ; the doctrine of infallibility crushes intellectual pride ; the celibacy of the clergy is a protest against the easy, comfortable notions of religion and its ministrations, with which the world attempts to serve God and mammon together ; monasteries and convents austere proclaim the nothingness of every thing in this life ; purgatory strikes at the fond wish of the sinner to believe that his sins are forgotten by God as soon as they are forgotten by himself ; the minute details of Catholic ceremo-



nial are disagreeable to a world which cannot bear too much fuss about religion, and loves "simplicity" in serving God, and in nothing else; the value of tradition is denied, because it makes labour and study obligatory upon those who would dogmatise or teach; the Papal supremacy is an abomination, because it interferes with the rule of national pride, and proclaims the power of God to set up an empire among men, without having regard to human conquests or human laws.

The revelation of Jesus Christ, then, being thus in direct antagonism with unconverted human nature, the real process of conversion begins when the doctrines of revelation are brought into direct contact with these antagonist principles, which are the true causes of the rejection of Catholicism. The intellectual proofs of the Catholic religion are abundantly cogent, when the mind is so affected by divine grace as to have lost (even in a slight degree) its original moral antipathies to the doctrines it proclaims. And it is when these doctrines are thus *applied* to the conscience, that the test commences its operation. If the grace of God awakens the requisite moral sensibilities, the work of conversion progresses; if the devil retains his hardening power, all the proofs on earth and in heaven will never make a sincere convert.

And if this be the case, are we not warranted in considering that the most prudent way of setting to work to convert our fellow-countrymen is to direct all our forces against the citadel of their fortress? What do we gain by actually concealing the most anti-Protestant of our doctrines? Nothing. What advance have we made, when we have deprived ourselves of any spiritual advantages, in order that we may not shock the fastidiousness of our Protestant neighbours? None whatever. There is one thing which in their natural hearts they abhor, and which is the secret source of their opposition: the doctrine of the Incarnation of the Son of God, and all its consequences as declared and embodied in Catholic dogma, Catholic rites, and Catholic morals. If we are prepared to banish *Christ crucified* from our creed, "liberal" Protestants will be really *conciliated*; but not till then.

---

ENGLISH CONSERVATIVES AND FRENCH  
RATIONALISTS.

*Des Rapports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme.* Par M.  
l'Abbé Gerbet, Vicaire-Général de Paris et d'Amiens.

THE treatise whose title we have prefixed has appeared in a series of articles in the *Université Catholique*, one of the ablest French theological reviews, and proceeds from a pen deservedly celebrated in the Catholic world. The title sets forth the object of these papers, namely, to demonstrate the necessary connexion subsisting between Rationalism and Communism. This whole question is undoubtedly in a state of much greater development among our neighbours on the other side the water than among ourselves. The logical connexion between ideas and morality, principles and practice, has been distinctly perceived, and fearlessly worked out and accepted, by the clear, rapid, and systematising French mind. Our own countrymen are much slower at this sort of work. They are by no means so impatient to apply a principle, or to deduce consequences from the ideas afloat in their minds, unless some immediate (as they would call it) practical result is clearly to be attained. They care little for what bears the appearance of a merely metaphysical or abstract connexion between certain ideas; things with them must be fitted for present use, or they are put by as subjects only suited to supply matter of speculation to philosophers, or amusement to men of literary leisure. An ordinary Englishman is therefore not at all anxious to classify, or arrange, or understand, the bearing of his general ideas and principles. They may be held by him in the most peaceful confusion, and the most antagonistic opposition to each other, and it distresses him not; nay, he does not even perceive it.

This, we apprehend, is far less the case with the ordinary Frenchman; and we take the class of ordinary men as an exemplification of our assertion, because they best exhibit the tendencies of the national mind. We imagine, then, that if you take on chance an Englishman and a Frenchman from that numerous class of persons from whom no danger is to be apprehended of a conflagration either in the Thames or in the Seine, you will find this marked difference between them. The Frenchman will have a certain definite system of ideas. He will have his little notions of philosophy, of taste, of criticism, of moral and social order, &c.; and he will not be satisfied unless these form, as he conceives, a compact and well-connected system of ideas, mutually harmonising and hanging



together. Of course, all this may be extremely shallow, and the connexion he perceives very superficial and one-sided, and his reasoning may be full of fallacies; this is another question: but what we mean is, that he will not feel contented without imagining that he possesses a consistent body of opinions, and can give an account of them satisfactory at least to himself. The commonplace Englishman, on the other hand, is no way solicitous to possess any lucid order among his ideas, save within the province of his own business or pursuit in life. The rigorous application of his intellectual powers to deduce consequences, or hunt back for principles, in order to arrive at the root of what he holds, begins and ends there. A great part of his mind is to him a *terra incognita*, or rather a sort of chaos. The consequence is, that many evil as well as good principles are held by him in a latent state; whereas it is quite otherwise with the Frenchman, whose theories, as we know, far from remaining thus dormant, are continually exploding, or threatening to explode, in some startling practical result.

There is evil as well as good resulting from both these peculiar national tendencies of mind. Perhaps it is owing to this strong habitual tendency to connect ideas, that medium goodness or badness is less abundant in France than England. There is less of that average moral and religious *respectability*, which neither aspires very high nor sinks very low; there is more of strong light and shade, and less of grey twilight. There is a certain heroism of goodness, or fanaticism of evil. There is exalted faith, or declared and unblushing infidelity. Anglican Protestantism could never have taken root and flourished in France. Our neighbours, speaking in a general way, will ever be Catholics or total unbelievers. If, on the other hand, *our* evil principles often remain comparatively harmless and infructuous, so unfortunately also do our good ones; and the alarm which the former ought to create, both in the mind that entertains them and in society at large, is set to sleep, and we go on congratulating ourselves upon the possession of a degree of moral eminence to which we have no solid claim. Besides, evil principles do not remain for ever dozing like the benumbed snake. Englishmen can think, and think deeply, and to some purpose, when once roused to reflection; and we see around us ominous symptoms of this awakening to active energy of principles, whose fearful application minds have hitherto either not perceived or timidly evaded. The press affords ample and alarming proof of the progress which an unmasked Rationalism is making among the thinking classes, —for Rationalism, however it may be disguised, already exists

wherever Protestantism exists; and any one at all acquainted with the state of mind of the poorer orders, must know how extensively the principles of Socialism are gaining ground among them.

The subject of the Abbé Gerbet's able papers is, therefore, by no means one of merely foreign interest, or one of which it may seem premature to treat; on the contrary, it has a peculiar interest as applied to ourselves, because, if there be any truth in the foregoing remarks, the order of minds to which the Abbé's argument is addressed is necessarily exceedingly numerous in this country. We will give his own words. He begins by clearly defining the terms *Rationalism* and *Communism*, and stating what they aim at:

"We have beheld," he says, "during these last three centuries, developing itself in different degrees among all civilised nations, a principle to which the name of *Rationalism* has been given. According to this principle, each man can reasonably admit as truths those things alone of which he acquires the proof directly, by means of his own conceptions. In our day we have seen the beginning of the evolution of another principle, according to which each man can retain as his lawful possession those things alone the enjoyment of which he obtains through his own labour. This principle is the foundation of what is called *Communism*."

"Rationalism may be summed up in this formula: it proclaims the sovereignty of the individual in the *intellectual* order; pretending to emancipate his intellect from the rules and restraints imposed upon him by religious society, which is founded upon traditional dogmatical teaching. The general formula of Communism is the sovereignty of the individual in the *material* order; it pretends to emancipate his physical energies from the rules and restraints imposed upon him by domestic and political society, which is founded on the hereditary transmission of goods. The first speaks in the name of reason, the second in that of justice."

"But both the one and the other proclaim, under different relations, the sovereignty of the individual, with a view to establish the same result, each in its own order, viz. community. According to Rationalism, the destruction of all belief received upon authority will entail community of intellectual goods, and participation in all the sources of truth. According to Communism, the destruction of all property acquired by inheritance will produce community of material goods. The one promises, as the result of community, an indefinite progress of knowledge; the other an unlimited increase of enjoyment."

"Modern society" (the Abbé continues) "divides itself, as respects these two doctrines, into three classes. The first is neither Rationalist nor Communist; it is composed, speaking generally, of all those who have Christian faith, in the proper sense of the word. These constitute the mass of the defenders of those maxims which



are conservative of property. They profess to believe that if Christianity promulgates, together with the fundamental law of fraternal charity, the principle of union amongst men, it recognises also another law which consecrates, under the name of property, the division of goods.

"The second class is both Communist and Rationalist. The leaders, the writers, and the agents of Communism are generally to be met with in the ranks of that philosophy which is hostile to faith. They call themselves the continuators of the philosophical movement of modern times, the true inheritors of the lights which it disseminated. I have considerable doubts whether many among them could give a very clear account of this relationship, or whether they have examined to any depth the questions belonging to it. But although they may not perceive with any distinctness the connexion between Rationalism and Communism, they believe at least that they are sensible of their affinity.

"The third class occupies a middle position. In religious matters it is Rationalist; in matters which concern property it is Conservative. It thinks that Rationalism and Communism, although they appear to be parallel doctrines in certain respects, are nevertheless radically distinct. Not only does this class hold to the first as obstinately as it rejects the second, but it believes, at least it hopes, that Rationalism, being the normal state of the human intellect, and consequently enabling it to put forth its strongest powers, can alone in the long-run achieve an effectual triumph over social errors. Nevertheless, it is of opinion that the belief in Christian truths, which rules a large portion of the population, is, as a matter of fact, most useful, and even necessary, in order to prevent the spread, and counteract the influence, of those systems which alarm it: this, however, it considers but a relative and temporary need. It is convinced that if the lights which it possesses, and which are in themselves sufficient, come to be gradually diffused, and in a due proportion, among the inferior classes, the whole of society will become so eminently intellectual, that it will be well able to take care of itself by the sole power of reason, without the help of faith."

Now this class we believe to be not only extremely numerous, but at the present time the most influential, and the dominant one in this country. A glance at the spirit in which the counsels of the nation are guided, and in which our rulers undertake every measure of supposed improvement, will suffice to convince us of this. Rationalist in the order of ideas, conservative where property is at stake; valuing religion, not as teaching the knowledge and the love of God, but simply for what it can effect in the moral and social order of things; idolising the idea of the progress of the human race, that is, the progress of the intellectual animal man in scrutinising the laws of nature, that he may wield her vast powers so as to minister to the indulgence of his senses and the grati-

fication of his intellect; dead to the spiritual end for which man was created, and which all else should but subserve; abhorring, therefore, the very idea—the very name—of spiritual power, and striving ever to make it the mere servant of the temporal, yet at the same time casting a glance of fear at the mass of Socialism fermenting all around them, a fear quieted only by an occasional *act of faith* in England's supposed charter of immunity from the evils which fall on other nations; as anxious to preserve the sacred and traditionary principles which guard the rights of property, as they are to pull down all notion of a purely spiritual authority, the guardian of the truths of faith;—such are our modern statesmen, and such are the principles on which the government of this country is conducted; a government which, as is well known, is itself ruled by the spirit of the influential and dominant class; and such principles, we venture to say, are entertained, with more or less of distinctness, by a vast body of those who possess property in these realms. It will be objected, perhaps, that *as a body* this class are far from professing or avowing infidel opinions; that, on the contrary, they desire, speaking in a general way, to uphold religion in some form or another; and that though of course avowed infidels are to be met with, and, it must be confessed, assume every day a bolder tone, yet that there exists not in this country a class who, *as a class*, can be collectively described as the one which the Abbé Gerbet characterises as devoid altogether of religious belief.

Waving the question as to the spread of open infidelity among us, which, however, we should be disposed to consider as much greater than is imagined by the generality, we have an answer to make altogether independent of this consideration. We have already remarked that Protestantism is based upon the principle of Rationalism; but Protestantism must be viewed under two aspects; as it is in the abstract, and as it is in the concrete. In the abstract, it lays down the principle of private judgment, which is, of course, utterly at variance with the Catholic doctrine of authority and traditionary teaching. In the concrete, as Protestantism does not avow its identity with unbelief, it has to put forth a religion, and so to become *constructive* instead of *destructive*; that is, it is forced so far into a position of direct contradiction to its own principles: it begins to teach, and therefore, if it would claim any right to be heard, to teach upon the plea of some species of authority. Hence a contradiction in the minds of Protestants themselves: they hold the principle of infidelity, though often, by a happy inconsistency, with more or less of belief on the surface of



their minds, or, as we would hope, still cherished in their hearts. The proper development, however, of Protestantism is unbelief; and we do not see why the Abbé's remarks are not as applicable to latent as to avowed infidelity. His object is to shew that the conservative Rationalists of France are inconsistent in rejecting the moral and social consequences of the opinions which they hold, with a thorough consistency, in spiritual and intellectual things. The argument, surely, has not less force as directed against the corresponding class in this country, merely because many, or, as we may hope, the majority of them, have not as yet thoroughly carried out their principle even in the domain of spiritual truth. This is but one inconsistency the more. Besides, there is one striking resemblance between them, which we have already noticed, in the light in which they regard religious truths, that is, not for what they *are*, but for what they can *do*. This is to reject the Catholic principle of an authority teaching a body of objective doctrine, which claims the homage of our faith and obedience, simply on the ground of its being the truth of God, as completely as any infidel rejects it. We shall, therefore, make no further apology for considering the Abbé's argument as equally cogent when addressed to the Rationalists, *i. e.* the Protestants, of England, as when urged against the avowed unbelievers of France.

The importance of the subject cannot be overrated.

"I have the deepest conviction," says M. Gerbet, "that Rationalism and Communism form essentially one and the same principle acting in two different spheres, and that the second does but realise, in the order of material enjoyments, what the first has propagated in the superior intellectual region. If this be so, this class (that of conservative Rationalists, whom he is addressing), so powerful from their numbers, intellectual culture, general activity, and social position, lie under an immense responsibility."

We believe that the same may be said with perfect truth of that influential class in our country who are so unhappily and unknowingly playing into the hands of Communism; and any thing which may serve to direct attention to this fact cannot be urged too strongly on them.

One word more before we proceed to give a slight sketch of the Abbé's line of argument. An objection may be taken to it which our author has foreseen, though he does not notice it until his concluding chapter. This objection is not new to ourselves, as we have often heard it advanced against the arguments employed by Catholics when reasoning with those who are external to the Church.

The force of the objection consists in this, that such a line

of reasoning is destructive, not constructive, forcing men, on pain of appearing inconsistent, to adopt further consequences which they had hitherto not apprehended. We cannot reply better than in our author's own words.

"If this reproach were just, I should have for my accomplices all the defenders of religion. They have always chosen a course analogous to that which I have myself pursued. When in the seventeenth century the great Catholic controversialists, with Bossuet at their head, strove to prove to the Lutherans and Calvinists that Protestantism logically leads to the destruction of Christian faith and to indifference in religious matters, men might have said to them also, as in truth they did, 'You maintain a fatal thesis. You push men who admit certain Christian dogmas to throw off Christianity altogether, if they would not be taxed with inconsistency. Is it not better that men should be Protestants than Deists?' This objection did not silence the defenders of the Church. They replied, that to avoid inconsistency the Protestant Christian was not forced to become a deist; he had only to return to being a Catholic."

The Abbé applies the same argument to the case of deists, atheists, and materialists, upon whom Protestants themselves are in the habit of urging the fatal consequences which their principles involve. He then continues:

"The fact is, that the defence of truth against any system of error whatsoever necessarily implies a mode of procedure similar to that with which we are reproached. Error is combated, not only by disputing its principles, but also by exposing its consequences."

We would add, that even where principles are disputed, the process is still fundamentally the same; and whether the question be put in a constructive or destructive shape, its real purport is not altered. You ask a man either, why holding so much, he does not hold more, or why rejecting so much, he still holds what he does hold. If he really *believes* in earnest what he has retained, it is impossible he should embrace the destructive alternative. Any how, the danger is one which cannot be avoided, if we would attempt to win men from error. We fully coincide with another remark of our author's:

"It is much more important," he observes, "that a Rationalist should become a Catholic, than it is matter of regret that a Conservative should become a Communist. The adversary of property subverts, at least directly, only the material basis of *human* society; while the adversary of the faith directly assails the very basis of that society which binds men to God, and consequently the mutual relations of men with each other."

There is no great danger in England of our conservative Rationalists being driven, by the love of consistency, to em-



brace Communism. They are, as a class, either well-to-do, as it is called, in the world, or at any rate have something to lose, which they are little disposed to sacrifice for a theoretical consistency, about which, as we have shewn, men are not greatly solicitous in this country. There is much more danger of their embracing the ultimate consequences of the doctrine of private judgment in the spiritual order, rather than give up this their beloved opinion. It is, therefore, well to shew them that the train of consequences cannot stop there; and though they may be prepared to sacrifice their God to a logical necessity, they will pause perhaps when they apprehend that the next demand will be upon their purses and estates.

While we maintain, however, that truth, when set before men, must, like its Divine Source, He who is Himself the very Truth, often become a stumbling-block to men, instead of the rock of their salvation, we are free to confess that it is not always discreet to advance the arguments in favour of it in what may be called their destructive form. Where error is the fruit of an almost inculpable ignorance, we think men should rather be called upon to believe more on the strength of what they already accept, than asked why they believe so much. Such persons, in fact, need illumination and patient instruction rather than startling argument. They have to be led on rather than contended with. But where error has the actively heretical element about it, it is vain to hope to deal with it in this way. A man who has imbibed the spirit of heresy does not *love* truth sufficiently to follow where it leads. What he loves is his own opinion and himself; and it is only by holding up before his eyes the hideous consequences of the principles he has adopted, that it can be hoped to make much impression upon him.

In reviewing this work, we must necessarily pass over without notice much that would interest our readers. We can give only a general idea of the author's argument, and that with a view principally of pointing out the coincidence in spirit of the less developed Rationalism of Protestant England with that which finds a more definite expression among the freethinkers of France. If they be radically identical, there is the same danger in the social order to be apprehended from the sway of such principles among ourselves as on the other side the Channel. Men, it is true, may flatter themselves that the application of these principles by the lower orders is but a remote contingency, seeing that even the educated classes are so insensible as yet to their full scope and bearing; but this would be greatly to delude ourselves, and to shut our eyes to

the ordinary course of things. The pressure of social disadvantages, which morally degrades them and leaves them destitute of all religious belief, arouses the passions of men, and naturally impels them to regard with enmity that society which, instead of fostering them in its bosom, seems to cast them forth as aliens, and to lie like an incubus upon them. Men, under these circumstances, do not await the clear development of those principles which serve to justify their hostility, though they greedily seize at the first glance on doctrines which seem to transform an envious and sullen discontent into a just and laudable indignation. These feelings of animosity, as a matter of fact, are alive and potently working in the breasts of thousands, though at present kept down by the strong arm of power; and, what is worse, they are on the increase. They grow as our mass of pauperism and heathenism grows; and by and by (nor does the time appear far removed) the conservative classes will have a hard battle to fight to maintain their ground. What, then, is to be done? Protestant and respectable England would fain argue with this mass, and indoctrinate it with better and safer notions, if not for the love of God, for the love of self; it would tame the monster if it could, ere it attain its mature and terrible strength. But it is powerless to effect what it would desire. Can we suppose that the practical Communist will not keenly perceive the weak points in such arguments as Protestants can bring to bear upon him? Nay, does he not already perceive them? Are not men always most sharp-sighted in discovering pleas to justify their evil desires, and do they not instinctively grasp at whatever holds out this promise? Demagogues, too, are never wanting to translate into popular language, and push to their extreme consequences, those theories which lend their sanction to the passions of the multitude; and who can estimate the tremendous power which these passions acquire when those who are actuated by them have persuaded themselves, or have been persuaded by others, that they can take their stand upon some principle of justice and common sense, and when, strong in this persuasion, they can also point to the weakness, hollowness, and inconsistency of the arguments employed by their adversaries? We must postpone, however, the remarks we have to make till our next Number.

---



## THE PARSON FLY-FISHING.

*The Erne, its Legends and its Fly-Fishing.* By the Rev. Henry Newland, Rector and Vicar of Westbourne. Chapman and Hall.

THE Rev. Henry Newland is a liberal-minded (not a "liberal") parson, of a school not now so common as in days gone by. He shews that he is of no very modern school by calling himself a *parson*; a term which, though used in a technical sense by Catholics when they would distinguish a minister of the Establishment both from a Catholic priest and a Dissenting preacher, has grown somewhat odious in the various Protestant clerical circles of the day. For the rest, Mr. Newland is an Englishman of gentlemanly feelings, kind heart, and good sense; with a keen relish for sport, at least of the piscatory kind; a staunch love for his own Communion, united with a degree of candour and respect for Catholics and their practices, which is rare enough in a clerical Tory, unless when, under the dominion of Puseyism, he has a passion for patronising a "sister Church," aping her ceremonials, and adopting her language.

Mr. Newland has written his book for the purpose of exalting the merits of the Erne and its fly-fishing, and of recording his reminiscences of many pleasant hours passed on its banks. This he does by introducing four interlocutors, the Captain, the Parson, the Squire, and the Scholar; and the volume professes to narrate their sayings and doings during a season of sport on the Erne and its neighbouring lakes. The *facts*, he tells us in his dedicatory epistle, are true, but the characters are but the representatives of the three or four squires, the five or six captains, the dozen or so of parsons, and the innumerable multitude of scholars, whom he has met and consorted with in one or other of his pleasant summer campaigns, in company with his friend, Sir Charles Taylor. With the mysteries of fishing, the rising of trout, the weight of salmon, the manufacture of flies, he mingles a sufficiency of legends and scenes of Irish character; so that the whole is a very agreeable book of light, gossipy reading of its kind. The parson's Protestantism now and then peeps out, but it is in so good-humoured a way, and with so little real irreverence, that we cannot help wishing that of the 15,000 incumbents and curates of the Anglican Establishment none were more irreligious or more prejudiced than the "Rector and Vicar of Westbourne."

It is somewhat astonishing, even in these days of Imitative-Catholicism, to hear a genuine "parson" offering something very like an apology for the pilgrimages of Lough Derg.

Our author, though a Protestant to the core, is no friend to the Irish Orangemen; witness his clever picture of the worship of "Saint William of Orange." It is agreeable also to find a Protestant not ashamed to fulfil in his own case the prophecy of her who foretold that all generations should call her *blessed*.

" 'Come, my worthy young friend,' said the Squire, as the Captain finished his story, and the Scholar looked at him with a ludicrous expression of disbelieving wonderment, 'I think it is high time to turn in now; the Parson has been yawning this half-hour. Come along; never mind the fairies, and don't go dreaming of gaugers and clubs.' 'And do not be afraid of an Irish Vehmgericht,' said the Captain; 'at least not here: the Parson has been humbugging you; for Mother Johnson, besides being the civillest woman and the best cook in the three baronies, 'the best wife, the best Christian, and the best maker of cold rum-punch,' (only she makes it hot, and with whisky,) is, into the bargain, as thorough-going a Protestant as ever drowned a lily.' 'Drowned a lily?' said the Squire, interrogatively. 'Ay, drowned a lily,' said the Parson, quietly; 'a religious ceremony in these parts.' 'What the devil!' said the Squire; 'this is the first I have heard of it.' The Parson loved to get a rise out of his Orange and Protestant friend; so drawing himself up in his chair, in the attitude of a professor delivering a lecture, he began didactically:— 'The country of Ireland is divided into two religions: that of the higher classes is Anythingarianism; that of the lower, pure Popery. For further particulars on this subject see Swift, from whom I quote this passage. The principal difference between these two sects is, that the latter worship a multiplicity of Saints (being only too glad of any pretext whatever for keeping holiday and being idle); while the former, like the Mahometans, worship one only. This saint is William, king and confessor. St. William was duly canonised by Act of Parliament, and in England has had half the 5th of November dedicated to him, but in Ireland the whole of the 12th of July. On this latter day his worshippers walk in solemn procession to the church, where the pulpit (which is the Anythingarian high-altar) is profusely decorated with lilies, the flower sacred to the saint in question. This flower is not white, like that dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, indicating her purity, but of a strong brimstone colour; what that indicates, I do not know; it is, however, always regarded with high esteem and veneration. These lilies, duly consecrated by the sermon, which generally is a pretty strong one, are distributed to the worshippers, who immediately proceed to drown them. This part of the ceremony is, I believe, seldom or never performed in church. The bell of the flower is stripped from its stem, and is placed, stalk uppermost, in an empty tumbler, where it is immediately surrounded



with lumps of white sugar. It is then drowned, or covered with whisky, the national spirit, which, when the bells are large, generally fills about three-fourths of the tumbler; water is poured upon the top of this, particular care being taken by the celebrants that it be screeching hot. The whole then is solemnly drained to the very bottom, the leader first pronouncing a set form of words, which, like most religious mysteries, is totally unintelligible to the uninitiated. I cannot give you much information about the remaining part of the ceremonies, which, like those of Eleusis, are carried on throughout the whole of the night; but the next morning the *mystæ* are commonly found in as exhausted a state as ever was Pythoness of old. They are then generally carried to bed; and, indeed, are frequently some days before they entirely recover their senses.' The wrath of the Scholar had been gradually rising throughout the whole of this lecture, which the Parson delivered with the most absurd gravity; and there is no saying what might have been the upshot, had not the Squire good-humouredly pushed him down the stairs before him; while the Captain, who had just drawn back the curtain that concealed a far cleaner bed than the rest of the establishment would lead one to expect, shouted after him, 'Good night, Scholar! sleep in peace. Keep a civil tongue in your head about Rome, and may St. William have you in his holy keeping!'"

"The author has been furnished with a copy of the Commemoration-service of the great Anythingarian saint, by a correspondent from the north of Ireland. It would be altogether foreign to the tolerant spirit which so happily characterises the nineteenth century, were he to seem to condemn the religious observances of any denomination of Christians; moreover, he is not quite certain that he entirely understands one word of it. Nevertheless, he thinks it advisable to suppress certain parts, which a harshly-judging public might think blasphemous or indecent. The remainder is as follows:—'The glorious, pious, and immortal memory of the great and good King William, who delivered us from Popery, slavery, brass money, wooden shoes, and warming-pans. May he who refuses to drink this be rammed, and damned, and double-damned, and crammed into the great gun of Athlone, and fired up into the elements, and blown to smithereens, to make sparrow-bills for Orangemen's shoes! May his soul be in the Pope's belly, the Pope in the devil's belly, the devil in hell, hell in flames, and the key in the Orangeman's pocket . . . and a fig for the Bishop of Cork.'"

Inglis's book on Ireland is now pretty well forgotten, but our author has reminded his readers of its existence, not very much in a way to restore it to the animation of an extensive circulation. We suspect that for not a few of the marvellous stories which Protestants contrive to digest respecting Ireland and Catholicism Paddy himself is answerable, from his love of bothering the heretics.

" 'How on earth,' said the Captain one day to the Parson, 'do

you pick up all these stories? People never tell them to me.' 'Because you laugh at them,' said the Parson. 'An Irishman is very sensitive to ridicule. Perhaps he has a secret consciousness that some of these stories of his require a little faith in the hearer, and he will not subject his cherished belief to the test of an unfriendly one. One thing is quite certain, if you ask an Irishman a direct question about any thing, you will not get a direct answer. Did I never tell you about Inglis and his book?' 'No,' said the Captain. 'I have read his book, and a nice, pleasant, lively, well-written book it is; but singularly inaccurate, whenever you come to detail.' 'And well it may be,' said the Parson; 'and I will tell you how it happens that it is so. In the course of his travels Master Inglis comes to Ballyshannon, and asks for an intelligent guide to shew him the country. You will agree with me that he could hardly have found a more intelligent fellow than the man he got; our friend Pat Gallagher, no less. I was talking to Pat about it the other day. 'He got out a big pocket-book,' said Pat, 'and he cut his pencil, and he sat down on a rock-stone, and asked me about the priests, and the rents, and the crops, and the landlords, and what-and-all besides. I never saw such a divel for asking.' 'And what did you tell him, Pat?' said I. 'O, the divel a word of truth did he get from me, your riverence.' 'Why, you don't mean to say that you let him put down a parcel of stuff that was not true!' 'Troth, an' he did, then, your riverence.' 'And why on earth could you not tell him the truth?' said I. 'Ah! Who would be the fool, then?—how would I know what he'd be after?' 'But what *did* you tell him?' said I, laughing; for I was mightily tickled at the idea of Inglis's describing from personal observation, as he calls it, the manners and customs of the Irish. 'Why, then,' said Pat, 'I disremember me just the particular lie that I told; it was just the first that came into my head.' 'Well,' said the Captain, laughing, 'at all events Paddy ought not to complain of being misrepresented by the Sassenagh, if that is the way he misrepresents himself. Poor Inglis evidently did his very best to get genuine information; it is not his fault that he did not get it.' 'Yes, but no bookmaker can take the right way to get it,' said the Parson; 'he cannot find time. You are not going to pick up accurate information by galloping along a turnpike-road, and asking questions right and left of you. With respect to Inglis though, I am afraid a graver charge lies against him. He started on his travels with a strong Whig bias, and put leading questions; and you know that you may get any Irishman to tell any lie you please out of mere civility. He is just the boy for a leading question. The Squire once made a bet with me that he would, within ten minutes, make the same man say that the same place was five and fifteen miles off, when we knew its distance to be ten; and he won it. So it was with Inglis. You know that wretched estate of Lord Palmerston's, that I pointed out to you on the road from Sligo to Ballyshannon. Some years ago I was positively taken to that estate, by way of shewing me the extreme of misery which the curse of absenteeism inflicts on a country. Well,



you may judge of my surprise, when, some time afterwards, I took up Inglis's book, and found this very place lauded up to the skies, and contrasted with Haslewood—another estate near Sligo, the property of a resident landlord, Mr. Wynne—the owner of which was described as ‘one of those short-sighted landlords.’ Now, I do not know much about farming; but as Mr. Wynne's country had always seemed, to my inexperienced eyes, to be more like England than any thing I had seen in Ireland, I really was a little astonished. Some time after, on passing through Sligo again, I discovered the solution. Inglis had begun his system of cross-examination and leading questions: ‘Was not Lord Palmerston very popular here?’ ‘Was not his domain in fine order?’ ‘Was not he an excellent landlord?’ and so forth; and then sallied forth with his ‘intelligent guide’ to judge with his own eyes as before. His intelligent guide, who had not exactly expected this, was a little taken aback; and being pretty well aware that Lord Palmerston's estate would not pass muster, took him to the next estate, and shewed him a nice little village which had just been built on the side of Benbulbin, by my old friend and schoolfellow, Sir Robert Gore Booth. Inglis might have said, and with very great justice too, that the landlord of that village was, if not the best, at least one of the best landlords in the land; but this, as Sir Robert was a wicked Tory, would have suited neither Inglis's purpose nor that of his intelligent guide, whose object was to procure him the peculiar sort of information he was so anxiously seeking. So the guide suppressed names, but went on examining the people, and helping Inglis to elicit all sorts of praise of their *landlord*, which, in truth, their landlord fully deserved; all this was carefully logged down in Inglis's pocket-book to Lord Palmerston's account, and afterwards appeared as such in print.’ ‘Well, but who can guard against a man who takes you out, and tells you deliberate and very ingenious lies?’ said the Captain. ‘*Vult decipi et decipitur*,’ said the Parson; ‘he looked for a lie, and he found it. You will always do that in Ireland; the people are but too happy to have the chance.’ ‘It is a pity poor Inglis died,’ said the Captain. ‘Lord Palmerston could have done no less for so thick-and-thin a supporter than give him a jolly good situation in the Foreign Affairs.’ ‘He would have made a first-rate ambassador,’ said the Parson; ‘he was just the fellow to lie abroad for the good of his country.’”

Mr. Newland, as we have said, is a Tory, or something of the species; and here are *his* notions of “Justice to Ireland.”

“‘Upon my soul,’ said the Captain, ‘there is a great deal of truth in this. John Bull, worthy, honest, conceited old gentleman, is fully convinced that no one can enjoy, or ought to enjoy, one single day's comfort or happiness in any other habiliments than his own wide-skirted blue coat, broad-brimmed, flat-crowned hat, and brown-topped boots; he has, in his wonderful generosity, fitted out poor Paddy with a full suit of his own as good as new, and now gets thoroughly scandalised that his jaunty cousin has cocked the steady, sober old hat

over one eye, trod the respectable boots down at heel, and is trailing the venerated blue coat through the mire, with a flourish of sticks, and a 'Hooroo! who'll dare to tread on that?' I remember, when I was ten years old, a fox-hunting old uncle of mine rigged me out in a pair of top-boots and buckskin breeches, just like his own; and the first thing I did with them was to put them on for an evening party. If John really has Paddy's welfare at heart, he will not stick him up with such manly absurdities, but fit him out with a good round boy's jacket, send him to school, give him a little birch and plenty of kindness, and by and by he will wear his long-tailed coat with the best of them."

The old woman's wish about the mould-candles in the following, our author says, is the genuine property of his friend Sir Charles Taylor:

"The Squire's advent was a thing as earnestly watched for by the beggars, as the rising of the sun by the Mussulman Arab; for, in truth, the worthy man's liberality got far the start of his judgment, and shillings and sixpences flowed from both pockets with indiscriminate profusion. And there they stood in every variety of age, sex, and condition: old and young, men and women; widows, whose strapping husbands were waiting for them round the corner; and desolate orphans, whose parents wanted money for the next shebeen house. Here and there stood modest poverty; but its voice was lost in the clamour, and seldom reached the Squire's ear. Yet, disgusting as this scene was, it was not without its scraps of Irish humour. 'May every hair in your honour's head,' said a wild old lady, looking at his powdered and pomatumed locks—'May every hair in your honour's head be a mould-candle to light your sowl to glory.' And as he bowed, hat in hand, in acknowledgment, and disclosed his bare crown—'May the blessed Vargin give you more of them.'"

---

#### SHORT NOTICES.

DR. CROOKALL has edited three of a series of *Italian Masses* (Burns and Lambert), by Casali, Fazzini, and others, which may be strongly recommended to choirs who would cultivate a style of music at once religious in tone and scientifically good. They are for four voices, with an easy organ accompaniment, and, above all, of a proper length. At the same time, we should caution those who are not already familiar with the Italian music of this school, against judging of their merits from a bare performance of the accompaniments on the piano-forte or organ. They are essentially vocal compositions, adapted to voices of ordinary compass and flexibility, and to be appreciated must be *sung*. They are not the kind of works which will please those who love vocal display or dashing accompaniments, who think



that the perfection of ecclesiastical music is to be found in the solos of professional, or semi-professional, women singers, and which in practice varies between the theatrical and the vulgar. Wherever, on the other hand, Protestants are banished from our choirs, and the first object of singers and organists is the edification of the congregation, Dr. Crookall's publications cannot fail to be highly appreciated.

The recently published volume of the Oratory *Lives of the Saints* (Richardson) contains those of three great Jesuit missionaries, Fathers Segneri, Pinamonti, and de Britto. Father Segneri is well known as one of the most admirable devotional writers of a body so wonderfully fertile in every thing that relates to the guidance of souls, and his works are moreover regarded as models of purity in the Italian language. Father Pinamonti was the dear friend of Segneri, and like him, greatly distinguished for his writings. Father de Britto, of whom a striking portrait is given in the volume, was martyred in the East. Many readers will think this one of the most interesting volumes yet published in the series. Father Faber has prefixed to it a characteristic essay on Catholic Home Missions.

*The Duties and Happiness of Domestic Service ; or a Sister of Mercy giving Instructions to the Inmates of the House of Mercy under her care* (Dolman), hardly gives a fair idea of the contents of the little volume so designated. It was compiled for the use of the House of Mercy at Handsworth, by a priest of the diocese of Birmingham, and is, in fact, a complete outline of Christian duties in general, with an application to the circumstances of those for whom it is particularly designed. A vein of good sense and good feeling runs through the whole, and the work will make a very acceptable addition to a Catholic lending-library, and a present to persons engaged in any kind of service.

We have not for some time seen an abler little book than Mr. Thring's *Elements of Grammar taught in English* (Macmillan, Cambridge). The principles of all grammar are stated with a precision and a perpetual reference to their origin in the nature of language, as an exponent of thought, which advantageously distinguish Mr. Thring's treatise from all others that we know of. In the hands of a competent teacher, we have no doubt that it would greatly facilitate the learner's progress in a path by no means too easy, even when smoothest.

Two good lithographs, by Belgian artists, of the *Venerable Paul of the Cross*, founder of the Passionists, and *Monsignor Strambi*, of the same congregation, are now on sale by the English Catholic booksellers. They are both interesting portraits. That of the venerable Paul is a noble head, full of intellectual power and Christian benignity.

Those who would see at one view some astonishing instances of the tone and truthfulness of Protestant polemics should consult the *Dublin Review* for October. Three articles on "Pascal the Younger,"

No-Popery Novels, and the *Guardian's* Theory of Lying, are devoted to the exposure of a few of the phenomena of present controversy. Two other articles shew up the divided condition of the Establishment; and another exposes the modesty with which Englishmen, while persecuting English Catholics at home, claim a right to build a church for English Protestants in the Holy City itself. On the whole, the number offers as varied a contribution to the history of controversy as could well be found in the same space.

We recommend to our gardening and agricultural readers a very useful manual in the *Cottage Gardener's Dictionary*, edited by Mr. Johnson (Orr and Co.). It is published in weekly numbers and monthly parts, and about one-half of the entire work is now issued, at a very moderate price. No other book of the kind exists at such a cost, and brought down to the latest discoveries (as they may fairly be called) in gardening. The Dictionary embraces, in fact, every species of information requisite for the gardener, with the scientific names of every plant of importance, their description, colour, height, period of blooming and fruiting, with concise and *intelligible* directions for their culture. The writers are some of the most distinguished gardeners of the day.

The *Clifton Tracts* (Burns and Lambert) continue their useful and successful career. "Know Popery," one of the last issued, is especially pointed and amusing. Another number of the very clever series on Catholic Ceremonial has also appeared.

Mr. Gawthorn has published a *Statement of the whole Case*, between himself, the "Archbishop of Canterbury," and Mr. Beresford Hope (Richardson). Undoubtedly, if Mr. Gawthorn has done wrong, the Protestant public and the Protestant millionaire have taken good care to victimise him to their hearts' content.

## Correspondence.

### ANIMAL MAGNETISM.

*To the Editor of the Rambler.*

THE author of the article in question, in his summary of the Roman decisions on the subject, has omitted a more recent one than either of those given by him; namely, a reply made to an application from his Eminence Mgr. Gousset, the present Cardinal Archbishop of Rheims, one of the greatest living authorities on the subject of moral theology. It was made in 1842, and was to this effect: Is magnetism lawful, guarding against abuses, and disclaiming all compact with the devil? The Cardinal Grand Penitentiary replied that this question *had not yet been maturely weighed* by the Roman court, and that an answer could not be given so quickly. Hence Mgr. Gousset concludes in his great work on Moral Theology (de 1<sup>o</sup> præcepto decalogi), "Having received no other answer, we think that *the use of magnetism ought to be tolerated* until



Rome has pronounced." He, however, prescribes several conditions, as that the magnetiser and the patient should be in good faith, that they should act with decency and propriety, and should renounce all dealings with the devil.

P. Gerry, S. J., Professor of Moral Theology in the Roman College in 1847-48, in his *Compendium of Moral Theology (in eodem loco)* (recently published, by the way, by Perisse Frères in Paris), concludes the above summary of this part of the case by saying, "we think that in practice this opinion must be adhered to." ROMANUS.

[We have omitted the concluding paragraph of our correspondent's letter, in which he objects to the discussion of such a subject as animal magnetism in the pages of the *Rambler*. He has evidently, as we think, misconceived the letter to which he refers, from Cardinal Castracane, in reply to Mgr. Gousset. The Cardinal informs the archbishop that the Inquisition has not decided on the *general question of magnetism*, and refers to the condemnation of its use in all those cases in which the Holy Office had been applied to. We should also call the attention of *Romanus* to the fact, that the Cardinal refers to the *public journals* as appropriate vehicles for making known the decrees of the Inquisition. We cannot but think that Mgr. Gousset's question was anticipated in those put by the Bishop of Lausanne, and distinctly answered by the Holy Office. Mgr. Gousset himself considers that it was not. Compare his own statement, that he asked if, "*sepositis rei abusibus, rejectoque omni cum dæmone fœdere, il était permis d'exercer le magnétisme animal, ou d'y recourir, en l'envisageant comme un remède que l'on croit utile à la santé;*" with the first and fourth questions put by the Bishop of Lausanne. See *Rambler* for October last, p. 323.]

## Ecclesiastical Register.

### BEATIFICATION OF FATHER PETER CLAVER.

On the 21st of September, the solemn function of the beatification of the venerable servant of God, Peter Claver, was celebrated in the patriarchal basilica of the Vatican.

At the exterior porch, where the Pope gives the solemn benediction, was displayed a standard, representing the blessed Claver recommending to God the poor negroes whom he leaves upon earth deprived of all human succour. This tableau bore the following inscription:

A DEO OPTIMO MAXIMO.

Petrus in æternæ lucis sinum accersitus,  
Jesu Christo Servatori generis humani  
Mauros, quos omni ope destitutos deserit,  
enixa obsecratione commendat.

At the principal gate of the basilica, under the portico, was to be seen another tableau, with this inscription:

Mauri ad Neocarthagenas ex Africâ appellentes  
Petrum, corpore quidem ægroto  
at alacri eos animo ad litus præsolantem,  
docilesque de navi ad ejus pedes corruunt.

On the two lateral gates we read two verses of the holy Scripture, one taken from the book of Job, cap. 22 : "Auris audiens beatificabit me . . . eo quod liberâssem pauperem vociferantem et pupillum cui non erat adjutor. Oculi fui cæco et pes claudo. Pater eram pauperum." The other verse was borrowed from Psalm lxxi. : "Coram illo procident Æthiopes . . . et usuris et iniquitate redimet animas eorum et honorabile nomen eorum coram illo."

The pilasters of the great nave were covered with magnificent draperies in red damask. The immense platform, which extended from the confessional of the holy Apostles to the altar of the chair, had assumed, under the intelligent direction of the Chevalier Sarti, a novel and most graceful appearance. On either side were placed two paintings, representing the principal miracles of the beatified father. At the bottom of the apse, above the chair of St. Peter, was the portrait of the blessed Claver. The splendour of this decoration was heightened by the beauty of the illumination. The finest effect was produced by two long lines of lights, which were displayed around the portrait of the blessed Claver.

At half-past ten their Eminences the Cardinals, the Chapter of St. Peter's, and the Reverend Consultors of the Rites, took their places. Then the most Rev. P. Roothaan, General of the Society of Jesus, was presented to Cardinal Lambruschini, as the Prefect of the Congregation, and in a discourse on the merits of the venerable servant of God, he demanded that the brief of beatification should be promulgated. After the reading of the brief, the "Te Deum" was solemnly chanted, during which the portrait of the blessed Father was displayed, the bells sounding, and the cannon firing from the Castle of St. Angelo. The versicle and collect proper for the beatified were recited by Monsignor Cardelli, Archbishop of Acerida, who celebrated a Pontifical High Mass. Our most Holy Father the Pope came to venerate the image of the beatified in the evening. After vespers he received the usual oblations, and stopped some time to admire the beauty of the paintings and decorations. In the evening the façade of the house and church of the Jesuits was illuminated.

LETTERS APOSTOLIC FOR THE BEATIFICATION OF THE VEN. PETER  
CLAVER, OF THE COMPANY OF JESUS.

PIUS IX. POPE.

For a perpetual remembrance of the thing.

THE essence of Christian charity—the power which distinguishes it—is that of urging the hearts which it inflames to undertake the most arduous and most difficult enterprises for the glory of God and for the spiritual and corporeal good of our neighbour, by communicating to them an extraordinary energy, truly superior to mortal nature. And this, throughout all ages, since the days of the first preachers of the Gospel, manifestly appears in all those men remarkable for their holiness—those generous labourers whom the Divine Father of the household has never ceased to send into his harvest. Inflamed with the fire of Christian charity, they have accomplished so many and such great things, they have rendered such splendid services in all the ranks of the human family, that the deceptive and vain philosophy of our time—that enemy of the cross of Christ—cannot enter into a parallel with those heroes, or, without incurring certain confusion, venture to boast of producing such works or such benefits. Now, amongst those heroic men, animated with the spirit of the Apostles, who, since the discovery



of the Western Indies, have been seen cultivating without ceasing that new field open to their zeal, and civilising and winning to Jesus Christ the savage people of these countries, and leaving amongst them testimonies of Christian charity so profound and so glorious, the venerable servant of God, Peter Claver, professed priest of the Society of Jesus, has justly rendered himself remarkable. Born at Verdu, a town in Catalonia, in the diocese of Salsona, in the Spanish province of Tarragona, he was scarcely seventeen years of age, when, in order to consecrate himself more closely to God, he sought to enter into the Society of Jesus. He was admitted, and after his novitiate he repaired to Majorca, there to study literature and philosophy. There he met with the blessed Alphonsus Rodriguez, brother coadjutor of the Society, in whose intimacy he learned to what a serious ministry, and to what labours, he had been called by the divine will. In fact, in the year 1610, by the will of God, and by the orders of his superiors, he set out for the kingdom of New Granada, in South America, where he was ordained priest, and where he concluded his theological studies. From this period he dwelt at Carthagena, on the sea of the Antilles, a mart where merchants, openly devoted to the infamous slave-trade, conducted every year, like wretched cattle, ten or twelve thousand poor slaves, captured chiefly on the African coasts, and sold them to the highest bidder. Touched with compassion towards these unfortunates, the venerable Peter, devoting to them his existence, and consecrating himself to them by a vow, laboured constantly, during more than forty years, in instructing and baptising them, sustained by an invincible courage in the midst of difficulties and unheard-of privations. Thus did he singly, by his charity alone, gain over to Christ and to the Church a multitude of negroes so vast, that the number of them is reckoned at several hundreds of thousands. But he did not confine himself to spreading true religion in their souls; he occupied himself also with their corporal wants. How could his piety avoid embracing with his solicitude these unhappy creatures, emaciated as they were by the most horrible misery? At the news of each disembarkation of slaves, he rushed to the spot; he clasped in his arms these outcasts of freedom, now reduced by violence to the most cruel servitude. He eagerly exerted himself to obtain for them, as far as he could, the help they so much needed. To the naked he gave clothes, to the hungry he supplied food, to the sick remedies; and even amongst the latter, if he found some of them infected with the plague, it was to them that he delighted to devote himself, without any care for his own safety. The more repugnance and disgust he felt in the midst of such horrible exhalations and filth, the more did he redouble the efforts of a charity ever victorious. And as if these prodigious exertions on behalf of the suffering negroes had been but trifling toils, he moreover came to the aid of the inhabitants of Carthagena, and of such strangers as occasionally sojourned in that city. He won back to virtue and temperance those who led a licentious life. He applied himself to bring back heretics to the true faith—to make Mahometans pass free from the slavery of their superstitions to the blessed liberty of Christ. After so many labours, prolonged far into the night, he devoted to rest only the smallest portion of the night which still remained, and consecrated the rest to the honour of God, his Virgin Mother, the angels and saints. The divine charity which consumed him was so intense that, in the midst of his occupations, he always appeared rapt in God. As he was sweet and affable towards other men, especially the simple, so was he hard and severe towards himself, adding to so many labours continued mortification, like one accustomed from infancy to reduce his

body to subjection by the most austere life. This venerable servant of God, full of the merits of so many virtues, and especially of so many excellent works of charity, at length met a death worthy of so holy a life on the 4th day of the ides of September, in the year 1654. The fame of his sanctity having spread far and wide, his cause was referred to our venerable brothers, Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, of the Congregation of Sacred Rites; and the process of his virtues having been carefully drawn up, Benedict XIV., our predecessor, of glorious memory, after having addressed to God fervent prayers, decreed the heroism of those virtues by a public decree of the 8th of the kalends of October, in the year 1747. Then, when we had been called, notwithstanding our unworthiness, to the government of the Church, two of the miracles attributed to the prayers of the venerable Peter having been proved before us, with the advice of the consultors, and the judgment of the cardinals placed over the Sacred Rites, we confirmed the truth of the same by a decree dated the 4th of the kalends of the month of September, in the year 1848. Finally, assembled in our presence on the morrow of the ides of May of the present year, the Cardinals of the same Congregation unanimously declared, after having collected the suffrages of the consultors, that we might, when it seemed good to us, place the aforesaid servant of God in the rank of the blessed, pending the celebration of his solemn canonisation. Therefore, at the prayer of the whole Society of Jesus, with the counsel and consent of the same Congregation of Cardinals, by our apostolic authority, and by the tenor of these presents, we permit that the same servant of God, Peter Claver, professed priest of the Society of Jesus, be for the future called by the name of "Blessed;" that his body and his relics be exposed publicly to the veneration of the faithful, without, however, their being permitted to introduce them into the public supplications. Moreover, we permit, by our same Apostolic authority, to be recited every year the Office and Mass *Commune Confessoris non Pontificis*, with the proper prayers approved by us, conformable to the rubrics of the Missal and the Roman Breviary. We only grant the recital of this office to the city and the diocese of Carthage, to be performed in all the churches where the Society of Jesus is established, on the 9th of September, by all the faithful, as well Seculars as Regulars, who are held to canonical hours as to Masses. We allow all priests to recite them who shall officiate in churches where the feast shall be kept. Lastly, we concede that within a year from the date of these presents, the solemnity of the beatification of the servant of God, Peter Claver, be celebrated for the first time in the churches of the diocese and of the Society mentioned above, with the Office and the Masses, with the rite of a greater double, which we ordain to be done on the day which the ordinary superiors shall prescribe after the same solemnity shall have taken place in the basilica of the Vatican—the constitutions and apostolic ordinations, decrees upon non-worship, and all other things to the contrary, notwithstanding. And we direct that copies of the present letters, even printed—provided that they be subscribed with the hand of the secretary of the above-mentioned Congregation, and guaranteed by the seal of his prefect—be received with the same credit, even in the judiciary order, that they would have towards these present letters exhibited as a testimony of our will.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, under the Ring of the Fisherman,  
the 16th of the month of July, 1850, the fifth year of our  
Pontificate.

A. CARD. LAMBRUSCHINI.

Loco ✠ sigilli.



## ALLOCATION OF THE POPE ON SEPTEMBER 5.

SANCTISSIMI DOMINI NOSTRI PII DIVINA PROVIDENTIA PAPÆ IX.  
ALLOCUTIO HABITA IN CONSISTORIO SECRETO DIE V. SEPTEMBRIS  
ANNO MDCCCLI.

VENERABILES FRATRES,—Quibus luctuosissimis perturbationibus et calamitatibus ob tristissimas rerum conversiones multos per annos incluta Hispana Natio de Catholica Ecclesia et hac S. Sede tot illustribus gloriosissimisque factis optime merita, miserandum in modum fuerit exagitata, quæque gravissima, et nunquam satis deploranda mala amplissimi illius Regni Ecclesiis, Episcopatibus, Capitulis, Monasteriis, cunctoque Clero, Populoque fidei incubuerint, et quæ sæva deinde clades Catholicam Religionem, Sacrorum Antistites, ecclesiasticosque viros afflixerit, divexarit, quæque adversus sacratiora Ecclesiæ jura, ejusque bona, libertates, et adversus hujus Apostolicæ Sedis dignitatem auctoritatemque ibidem fuerint perpetrata, universo, qua late patet, terrarum orbi, ac Vobis multo magis compertum exploratumque est, Venerabiles Fratres. Atque optime scitis quanta cura et studio rec. me. Gregorius XVI. prædecessor Noster expostulationes, querimonias, preces adhibuerit, nihilque intentatum reliquerit, ut afflictis illis ac prostratis religionis rebus succurreret, mederetur, et consuleret. Neque ignoratis, qua sollicitudine Nos, vix dum licet immerentes, inscrutabili Dei judicio in ejusdem Decessoris Nostri locum suffecti, et in hac sublimi Principis Apostolorum Cathedra collocati fuimus, præcipuas paterni Animi Nostri curas cogitationesque ad clarissimam illam Nationem convertimus, quo ecclesiasticas ibi res, quantum fieri posset, ad Sacrorum Canonum normam componere, et inflicta Ecclesiæ vulnera sanare possemus. Quamobrem postquam certiores facti fuimus, præcipuas quasdam, ac portiores condiciones et cautiones a Nobis antea præscriptas fuisse admisras, ac in tuto positas, Carissimæ in Christo Filix Nostræ Mariæ Elisabeth postulationibus alaeri ac libentissimo animo obsecundantes ad Eam, ut probe nostis, misimus Venerabilem Fratrem Joannem Archiepiscopum Thessalonicensem opportunis facultatibus et instructionibus munitum, qui apud ipsam Catholicam Majestatem Apostolici Delegati, ac deinde, sub tempore Nostri et hujus S. Sedis Nuntii munus obiret, omnemque suam operam ecclesiasticis ibi negotiis tractandis, ordinandis, sedulo ac sollicitè impenderet. Ac meministis, Venerabiles Fratres, nihil Nobis potius, nihil antiquius fuisse, quam illius Regni Ecclesiæ legitimo pastore a longo jam tempore pene omnes misere viduatas idoneis Antistitibus in primis committere, Nostrasque in id curas, Deo bene juvante, et Ipsius Carissimæ in Christo Filix Nostræ opera, non levi certe animi Nostri consolatione optatum exitum habuisse.

Jam vero Vobis significamus Nostras sollicitudines pro aliis sacris ecclesiasticisque illius Regni rebus componendis susceptas, ob propensam præsertim ejusdem Carissimæ in Christo Filix Nostræ in Religionis bonam voluntatem haud cecidisse irritas. Siquidem post diuturnam operosamque tractationem Conventio inter Nos et Reginam Catholicam est inita, quam delecti ex utraque parte Plenipotentarii subscripserunt, Nomine quidem Nostro idem Venerabilis Frater Archiepiscopus Thessalonicensis, Nomine autem Reginæ dilectus Filius nobilis Vir Eques Emmanuel Bertran de Lis a publicis Majestatis suæ negotiis. Quam Conventionem ab eadem Regina, et a Nobis ipsis, audito consilio VV. FF. NN. S. R. E. Cardinalium Congregationis negotiis ecclesiasticis extraordinariis propositæ, jam ratam habitam, Vobis exhiberi mandavimus una cum Apos-

tolicis Nostris Litteris, quibus Conventionem ipsam confirmavimus, ut omnia clarius et plenius agnoscere possitis.

Illud quidem Nobis vel maxime cordi fuit, ut sanctissimæ nostræ religionis incolumitati, et spiritualibus Ecclesiæ rebus studiosissime consuleremus. Itaque constitutum perspicietis, Catholicam Religionem cum omnibus suis juribus, quibus ex divina sua institutione et Sacrorum Canonum sanctione potitur, ita unice in eo Regno, veluti antea vigere ac dominari debere, ut omnis alius cultus plane sit amotus et interdictus. Hinc cautum quoque est, ut instituendi ac docendi ratio in cunctis tum Universitatibus, tum Collegiis, tum Seminariis, tum publicis privatisque scholis cum ejusdem Catholica religionis doctrina plane congruat, atque Episcopi aliique Diocesani Antistites, qui ex proprii ministerii officio in Catholicæ doctrinæ puritatem tuendam propagandam, et in christianam juventutis educationem procurandam totis viribus incumbere debent, nullo prorsus unquam præpediantur impedimento, quominus publicis etiam scholis sedulo advigilare, et in illas pastoralis sui muneris partes libere exercere possint. Ac pari studio ecclesiasticæ auctoritatis libertatem dignitatemque asserendam curavimus. Etenim non solum statutum est Sacrorum præsertim Antistites ad Episcopalem eorum jurisdictionem exercendam plena libertate pollere, quo Catholicam fidem, et ecclesiasticam disciplinam tueri, et morum honestatem in Christiano populo tutari, et optimam juvenum, eorum potissimum qui in sortem Domini vocantur, institutionem procurare, et alia omnia proprii ministerii munera explere valeant; verum etiam decretum est omnes Regni Magistratus eorum operam præstare debere, quo ab omnibus Ecclesiasticæ auctoritati et dignitati debitus exhibeatur honor, observantia, et obedientia. Accedit etiam, ut præstantissima Regina, ejusque Gubernium iisdem Episcopis valido suo patrocinio, et præsidio omnem opem ferre profiteantur, cum ab ipsis pro pastoralis munere illorum potissimum hominum improbitas est cohibenda, et coercenda audacia, qui fidelium mentes pervertere, moresque corrumpere nefarie commoliuntur, et a proprio grege detestabilis, ac dira perversorum librorum pestis atque perniciēs est avertenda ac profliganda. Et quoniam relatum ad Nos est, ex nova diœcesium divisione majora spiritualia bona in illius Regni fideles redundare, iccirco novam hujusmodi circumscriptionem nostra auctoritate et ipsius Reginæ consensu peragendam statuimus, atque Apostolicas de hac re suo tempore proferemus Litteras, postquam ea omnia fuerint perspecta, et statuta, quæ ad rem ipsam perficiendam sunt necessaria. Cum autem Religiosæ Familiæ pie institutæ ac recte administratæ maximo sint Ecclesiæ et civili societati usui et ornamento, quantum in Nobis fuit haud omisimus eniti, ut illic Regulares Ordines conserventur, restituantur, augeantur. Atque in eam profecto spem erigimur fore, ut propter avitam ejusdem Carissimæ in Christo Filiæ Nostræ pietatem, et eximiam Hispaniæ Nationis religionem ipsi Regulares Ordines ibi pristina dignitate ac splendore fruantur. Ne quid autem Religionis bono quavis ratione officere possit, non solum constitutum est, Leges, Ordinationes, et Decreta quæcumque Conventioni adversantia de medio sublata omnino esse ac penitus abrogata, verum etiam sancitum, ut cetera omnia, quæ ad Ecclesiasticas res et personas pertinent, de quibus in Conventionem nulla est habita mentio, juxta canonicam, et vigentem Ecclesiæ disciplinam exigī, et administrari plane debeant.

Nec vero ea prætermisimus, quæ ad temporale Ecclesiæ bonum possunt pertinere. Omni enim studio, et contentione vindicandum, ac tuendam curavimus jus, quo Ecclesia pollet, acquirendi scilicet, et possidendi quæcumque bona stabilia et frugifera, veluti innumera prope Conciliorum acta Sanctorum Patrum sententiæ et exempla, et Præde-



cessorum Nostrorum Constitutiones apertissime loquuntur, sapientissime docent et demonstrant. Atque utinam ubique gentium, ubique terrarum possessiones Deo, ejusque Sanctæ Ecclesiæ dicatæ semper inviolatæ fuissent, et homines debita illas reverentia essent prosequuti! Equidem haud cogeremur deflere plurima, omnibusque notissima mala et damna in civilem ipsam societatem derivata ex injusta prorsus et sacrilega Ecclesiasticarum rerum, ac bonorum spoliatione et direptione, quæ ad funestissimos quoque ac perniciosissimos *Socialismi et Communismi* errores fovendos magna ex parte viam munivit. Jam porro in Conventione constabilitum firmatumque conspicietis Ecclesiæ jus novas acquirendi possessiones, ac simul sancitum, ut proprietas honorum omnium, quæ vel in præsentia possidet, vel in posterum acquireret, integra et inviolabilis omnino habeatur atque persistat. Hinc constitutum etiam fuit, ut, nulla interposita mora, Ecclesiæ illa omnia statim restituantur bona, quæ nondum divendita fuere. Verum cum ex gravibus ac fide dignis testimoniis acceperimus, nonnulla ex iisdem bonis nondum alienatis ita in deterius esse prolapsa, et administrationis incommodis obnoxia, ut evidens constet Ecclesiæ utilitas, si illorum pretium in publici æris alieni redditus numquam quavis alia ratione transferendos convertatur, ejusmodi permutationi indulgendum esse censuimus, postquam vero bona ipsa fuerint Ecclesiæ restituta.

Omnem quidem dedimus operam, ut Episcopi, Capitula, Seminaria, Parochi congruis, ac stabilibus potiantur redditibus, qui Ecclesiæ perpetuo addicti, ab ea libere erunt administrandi. Et si vero hi redditus cum antiqua Hispani Cleri dote conferri non possint, et ob temporum asperitatem minores, quam Nos optavissemus, existant; tamen probe noscentes, qua singulari religione et pietate idem Hispaniorum Clerus summopere præstet, plane non dubitamus, quin ipse in divina voluntate conquiescens, et omni virtutum genere magis in dies undique refulgens, in vineam Domini naviter scienterque excolendam alacriori usque solertia et studio incumbat, cum præsertim per ecclesiasticam libertatem in Conventione sancitam iis omnibus expeditus sit impedimentis, quæ antea libero sacri ministerii exercitio adversabantur, atque ita Populorum obsequium, amorem, et venerationem sibi magis magisque conciliet et devinciatur. Ceterum cum plenum ac liberum acquirendi ac possidendi jus fuerit sancitum ac servatum, patet Hispanis Ecclesiis aditus ad ampliores obtinendos redditus, quibus et majori divini cultus splendori et decentiori Cleri sustentationi facilius et commodius consulatur. Atque id felicioribus temporibus ex regia Carissimæ in Christo Filiæ Nostræ munificentia, ejusque Gubernii studio, et ex egregia ac perspecta Hispaniæ Nationis religione futurum Nobis pollicemur. Ex iis, quæ raptim cursimque commemoravimus, intelligitis, Venerabiles Fratres, quo studio Nostras omnes curas in ecclesiasticis Hispaniæ rebus instaurandis posuerimus, ac futurum confidimus, ut, divina adspirante gratia, in amplissimo illo Regno Catholica Ecclesia, ejusque salutaris doctrina quotidie magis latissime dominetur, vigeat, et efflorescat.

Nunc vero noscatis velimus, Dilectissimum in Christo Filium Nostrum Leopoldum II. Magnum Etruriæ Ducem et Lucensium Ducem pro egregia sua pietate vehementer optasse, ut vigentes in Etruria legis quodammodo ordinari et componi possent cum iis omnibus, quæ ecclesiasticas leges respiciunt. Itaque enixis precibus a Nobis efflagitavit, ut nonnulla interea temporis conciliare vellemus, cum eidem religiosissimo Principi in animo fixum destinatumque sit, plenam cum hac Apostolica Sede in posterum inire Conventionem, qua in regionibus ei subiectis ecclesiasticarum rerum regimini et rationibus prospere consulatur. Quocirca firma ac certa spe freti fore, ut idem Dilectissimus in Christo

Filius Noster ejusmodi Conventionem juxta Nostra desideria majori qua fieri potest celeritate sit initurus, illius votis obsecundantes aliqua capita a VV. FF. NN. S.R.E. Cardinalibus ejusdem Congregationis Negotiis ecclesiasticis extraordinariis propositæ perpensa, interim constituta fuere, quæ a Nobis, et ab ipso Principe rata habita sunt. Quibus quidem capitibus seu articulis inter cetera constitutum est, ut Episcopi omnem habeant libertatem in iis omnibus peragendis quæ ad sacrum pertinent ministerium, ac in scripta et opera, quæ de rebus ad religionem spectantibus tractant, censuram ferant, ut propriam eorum episcopalem auctoritatem libere adhibeant, ad fideles a prava quavis lectione tum religioni, tum moribus perniciose arcendos, ac simul cautum, ut omnes cum hac B. Petri Cathedra Catholicæ veritatis et unitatis centro libere communicare valeant, et causæ omnes spirituales et ecclesiasticæ ad sacræ potestatis judicium unice et omnino spectare debeant ex sacrorum Canonum præscripto. Non levi autem jucunditate affecti fuimus, propterea quod idem Dilectissimus in Christo Filius Noster haud omisit Nobis polliceri et profiteri, se omnem suam opem et operam esse collaturum ad sanctissimam nostram religionem tutandam, ad divinum cultum tuendum, et ad publicam morum honestatem fovendam, ac valido suo auxilio præsto futurum, quo Sacrorum Antistites episcopalem eorum auctoritatem libere exerceant. Quocirca confidimus, ut, Deo bene juvante, earum, quas indulsimus, rerum usus in Ecclesiæ utilitatem cedat, iis insuper difficultatibus penitus amotis, quæ hucusque ejusdem Ecclesiæ libertati obstiterant.

Denique certiores Vos facimus, Nostras jam convertisse curas ad Catholicæ religionis res in longinqua regione componendas, ac Nos magna spe sustentari fore, ut Conventio possit iniri, quæ juxta Nostra et vestra desideria Ecclesiæ juribus, rationibus, ac prosperitati respondeat. Ac vel maxime optaremus, ut hujusmodi exemplum omnes earum dissitarum partium regiones, quarum populos præcipuo caritatis affectu in Domino prosequimur, imitari properarent, quo penitus averterentur plurima et maxima damna, quibus in nonnullis præsertim earundem partium regionibus immaculata Christi sponsa cum summo animi Nostri dolore affligitur ac divexatur. Atque hic haud possumus, quin illis Venerabilibus Fratribus vehementer gratulemur, eisque meritas debitasque tribuamus laudes, qui in tristissima licet conditione ibi constituti, tamen haud omittunt episcopali eorum zelo et firmitate Ecclesiæ causam strenue tueri, ejusque jura impavide defendere, ac dilectarum ovium saluti sollicitè prospicere.

Hæc erant, Venerabiles Fratres, quæ Vobis hodierno die significanda existimavimus. Reliquum est, ut numquam desinamus dies noctesque in humilitate cordis Nostri, et in sinceritate fidei, firmitate spei, et caritatis ardore assiduas elementissimo misericordiarum Patri adhibere preces, ut omnipotenti sua dextera, quæ mari et ventis imperat, Ecclesiam suam sanctam a tantis, quibus jactatur, procellis eripiat, eamque solis ortu, usque ad occasum novis, ac splendoribus triumphis exornet et augeat.

#### EXECUTION OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST IN CHINA.

A LETTER from Hong-Kong, addressed to the *Univers*, gives the following details of the execution of M. Schœffler, a missionary priest:

“On the 4th May, about noon, by order of the grand mandarin, elephants and horses were prepared, and two regiments of satellites were under arms. The muskets were loaded, and every one expected



that it was an expedition against the rebels that was being fitted out, or that an attack was to be made on the haunt of some brigands. It was soon, however, understood that all these preparations had been ordered for the execution of M. Schœffler. The mandarin, fearing that the Christians would endeavour to rescue their missionary by force, wished to intimidate them by this display of troops. When his intentions were known, all the town shewed the greatest affliction. The gaolers, the prisoners, and all those who had had any connexion with the missionary, expressed their sorrow and regret. M. Schœffler, on the contrary, was smiling with delight, and he prepared to walk to the place of execution with greater ease by dressing himself as lightly as possible. The mandarin was apprehensive of a riot, and he took up his position on the ramparts, surrounded by his troops, all ready for action. The execution took place outside the town. The *cortège* of the martyr was arranged in the following manner. Before him marched a soldier, carrying a board affixed to a pole, on which was written, 'Notwithstanding the severe prohibition against the religion of Jesus, a European priest named Augustin has dared to come here clandestinely to preach and seduce the people. When arrested, he confessed every thing: his crime is evident. Let Augustin have his head cut off, and thrown into the river. Fourth year of Tu Du; first of the third moon.' Eight soldiers, with drawn sabres, marched by the side of M. Schœffler; one hundred men, armed with muskets or lances, formed the head of the procession; two elephants formed the rear guard. The martyr held up his chains when walking: he walked quickly, as if hastening towards his triumph, and continually offered up thanksgivings. He was surrounded by an immense crowd. The greater number of these pagans were struck with religious admiration; there were some, however, who railed and blasphemed. On arriving at the place of execution the martyr fell on his knees, kissed the crucifix three times, and at the request of the executioner, he took off his coat, and turned down the collar of his shirt. The executioner having afterwards tied his hands behind his back, the martyr said to him, 'Do your business as quickly as possible.' 'No, no,' replied the mandarin, who was informed of what M. Schœffler had said; 'follow the signal of the cymbal, and only strike at the third sound.' The signal was given: the hand of the executioner trembled. He struck three blows of his sabre on the neck of his victim, and was at length obliged to cut the flesh with a knife, in order to detach the head from the body. In Cochin China those who are present at executions are accustomed to disperse immediately it is over; but on this occasion, although the greater number present were pagans—for there are very few Christians at Son Tay—they rushed forward to collect some drops of the blood, and to get some portion of the garments of the martyr. It was remarked that an inferior mandarin, a pagan, before the execution, threw a coat of white silk and a piece of white linen at the feet of the martyr, in the hope that it would be stained with his blood. M. Schœffler, thinking, doubtless, that they belonged to some Christian, took them up, and placed them inside his shirt next his heart. When the chief mandarin was informed of what his subordinate had done, he ordered him to receive several blows with a stick; he, however, went off very delighted with the possession of his precious relics. The Christians obtained the body of M. Schœffler; but the head was thrown into the river, and had not been found when the above letter was written."

---

# **RULES OF THE CATHOLIC DEFENCE ASSOCIATION,**

ADOPTED AT THE MEETING IN DUBLIN ON THE 17TH OCT.

1. THAT as one of the great objects of this Association is to vindicate and develope Catholic doctrines and practices, so much misrepresented, it shall consist exclusively of members of the Catholic Church, who are recommended to solicit by their prayers the blessing of Heaven on its labours.—2. All Catholics who have paid to the treasurers the first annual subscription of one pound or upwards, previous to the 17th October instant, shall be members of, and entitled to speak and vote at the public meetings of, the Association, and be qualified to be chosen or elected members of the committee.—3. All Catholics who pay an annual subscription of one pound or upwards, after the 16th of October, 1851, on being moved and seconded by members, shall be eligible to be enrolled as members of the Association, with similar privileges.—4. All Catholics who shall have collected and paid one pound or upwards towards the funds of the Association shall be eligible as members, and be entitled to vote and speak at all the meetings of the Association.—5. All Catholics who shall pay one shilling, and less than one pound, shall be entitled to be enrolled as members, to be present at all the public meetings of the Association.—6. All Archbishops, Bishops, and clergymen shall be *ex-officio* members of the Association, on intimating to the secretary a wish to be enrolled as such.—7. The affairs of the Association to be conducted for the present by a general committee, consisting of the Archbishops and Bishops, and the following peers, members of parliament, clergy, and laymen, fifteen to form a quorum. (Here follows the list.)—8. The general committee to have power to select from amongst themselves sub-committees for the purposes of the Association.—9. All moneys received to be lodged in the Hibernian Bank, to the credit of his Grace the Primate, the Archbishop of Tuam, the Bishop of Meath, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, the Hon. E. Preston, John Reynolds, Esq., M.P., and John Clarke, Esq.—10. No sum of money to be paid away without the sanction of a majority of the finance committee, duly convened for that purpose, and on a check signed either by his Grace the Primate, or his Grace the Archbishop of Tuam, or the Bishop of Meath, and two others of the trustees.—11. The accounts to be audited once every three months by two auditors appointed by the general committee of the Association.—12. The accounts, when audited, to be open to the inspection of all the members of the Association.—13. All the officers, clerks, and servants of the Association to be appointed by, and to be under the control of, the general committee.—14. All public meetings of the Association shall be held at such times and in such places as the majority of the general committee, duly convened for that purpose, shall determine.—15. The general committee shall meet in the city of Dublin once a month for the disposal of business.—16. The secretary shall summon a special general meeting of the committee at any time, on a requisition in writing stating the objects of the meeting, and signed by at least five members of the committee, of whom one shall be an Archbishop or Bishop, and of which meeting seven days' notice must be given.—17. No member of the Association to be allowed to address the public meeting more than once upon any question, except the mover of an original resolution, who shall have the right of reply.—18. An amendment may be proposed on any original motion; but no second amendment shall be received until the first is disposed of.—19. A motion of adjournment may be proposed at any time, except when a member is addressing the meeting.—20. A member may at any time call another member to order, and the decision of the chairman on all questions of order to be final.—21. No resolution to be proposed at any public meeting, except a copy of the same be lodged with the secretary five days before the meeting.

✠ PAUL, Archbishop of Armagh, and  
Primate of all Ireland.

JOHN REYNOLDS, }  
JOHN SADLEIR, } Hon. Secretaries.  
WILLIAM KEOGH, }



# The Rambler.

## PART XLVIII.

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE
HISTORICAL SKETCHES OF DEVOTIONS TO THE BLESSED SACRAMENT . . . . .	423
MIRACLES : FATHER NEWMAN AND THE BISHOP OF NORWICH .	443
REVIEWS :—ENGLISH CONSERVATIVES AND FRENCH RATIONALISTS.—Des Rapports du Rationalisme avec le Communisme. Par M. l'Abbé Gerbet, Vicaire-Général de Paris et d'Amiens . . . . .	461
THE PROTESTANT CRITICISING.—1. Notes of a Residence in the Canary Islands, the South of Spain, and Algiers ; illustrative of the State of Religion in those Countries. By the Rev. Thomas Debary, M.A.—2. What is the Working of the Church of Spain ? What is implied in Submitting to Rome ? What is it that presses hardest upon the Church of England ? A Tract by the Rev. Frederick Meyrick, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford.—3. Heresy and Immorality considered in their respective bearing on the Notes of the Church : being a final Letter to the Editor of the <i>Guardian</i> . By William George Ward.—4. The <i>Spectator</i> Newspaper, No. 1213 . . . . .	471
QUAKERISM.—Quakerism ; or the Story of my Life. By a Lady who for Forty Years was a Member of the Society of Friends.—A Portraiture of the Christian Profession and Practice of the Society of Friends. By Thomas Clarkson, M.A. . . . .	486
SHORT NOTICES.—Dr. Pagani's Life of Dr. Gentili.—The Catholic Florist.—Didron's Christian Iconography.—Cecile, or the Pervert, by the Author of "Rockingham."—The Excellence of Melody, and the Music of the Ancients.—Father Seraphin's Reflections on the Passion.—The Seven Lights of the Sanctuary, by Miss Agnes Stewart.—Mamma's Stories. — Fenelon's Sacred Reflections for Every Day of the Month.—Lacordaire's Conferences in	

## CONTENTS.

	Page
the Cathedral of Notre Dame.—Wetzer and Welte's Kirchen-Lexicon.—The Clifton Tracts . . . . .	498
ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.—Decree of the Beatification, or De- claration of the Martyrdom, of the Venerable Servant of God, John de Britto, Priest professed of the Society of Jesus.—New Indulgences for the Recitation of the Chap- let.—Speech of the Rev. Robert Mullen on the Catholic University . . . . .	501

---

### To Correspondents.

C. F. D.—Received. The question has already been put to persons in the mesmeric sleep.

Correspondents who require answers in private are requested to send their complete address, a precaution not always observed.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications.

All communications must be *postpaid*. Communications respecting *Advertisements* must be addressed to the publishers, Messrs. BURNS and LAMBERT.